A HISTORY

OF THE

...TAMENT TIMES.

...RATH,

...SITY OF HEIDELBERG.

...POSTLES.

...OM THE SECOND GERMAN

..., B.A.

...S. HUMPHRY WARD.

E PUR SI MUOVE

WILLIAMS AND ...GATE,
14, HENRIETTA STREET, ...DEN, LONDON;
20, SOUTH FRED... EDINBURGH;
AND 7, ... OXFORD.

A HISTORY

OF THE

NEW TESTAMENT TIMES.

BY

DR. A. HAUSRATH,

ORDINARY PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF HEIDELBERG.

THE TIME OF THE APOSTLES.

VOL. II.

TRANSLATED, WITH THE AUTHOR'S SANCTION, FROM THE SECOND GERMAN EDITION, BY

L. HUXLEY, B.A.

WITH A PREFACE BY MRS. HUMPHRY WARD.

E PUR SI MUOVE

WILLIAMS AND NORGATE,
14, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON;
20, SOUTH FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH;
AND 7, BROAD STREET, OXFORD.

1895

LONDON:
PRINTED BY C. GREEN AND SON,
178, STRAND.

THE TIME OF THE APOSTLES.

VOL. II.

c Restor

CONTENTS.

Third Division.

Caligula and the Jews.

Fourth Division.

The Fate of Christianity in Palestine.

Fifth Division.

The Early Churches of the Dispersion.

Errata.

The references on pp. 38, 60, 101, 105, 110, 149, 204, to Vols. i. and ii. of the English Translation should be to Hausrath's "Time of Jesus."

Third Division.

CALIGULA AND THE JEWS.

CALIGULA AND THE JEWS.

1. The Change of Government in Rome.

"When Tiberius died, he left Caius the empire over land and sea free from insurrection; the law was respected; all parts of the realm were in complete harmony; north and south, east and west, nations of barbarian or Greek extraction, civilians and military, were all united in maintaining peace and enjoying its blessings.[1] . . . Three-and-twenty years had Tiberius ruled over land and sea, securing peace and the blessings of peace, and leaving his successor no cause to embroil him in war or light up a conflagration in the future."[2] Such is Philo's verdict on the rule of Tiberius; but his opinion must be discounted by the fact that the situation Caligula found in the East was by no means so peaceful as asserted by the Alexandrian teacher in his blind hatred against the emperor. Still this Jewish judgment on Tiberius is remarkable, considering that he had shown great severity to the Roman Jews. Once more we see that the provincials thought very differently of the emperor whom the Roman aristocracy hated so bitterly. In him they honoured the man before whom their oppressors quailed, and who had established a permanent and reasonable administration in place of a rapid succession of officials in feverish haste for gain. To this day many inscriptions bear witness to his firm administration, beneficence and justice.[3] Every kind of business flourished; the tribunals were free from corruption.[4]

[1] Leg. ad Gaium, Mang. 546, 547. [2] Ibid. 566.

[3] Suet. Tib. 37; Tac. Ann. 1, 81; 2, 1; Inscrr. Orelli, 689, 3796. Cf. Hertzberg, Gesch. Griechenl. unter den Römern, 2, 4, seq.

[4] Suet. Tib ,33; Tac. Ann. 1, 74; 2, 34; 3, 10, &c.

It is true that the emperor's misanthropic and hesitating temperament permitted him at times to regard the grievous sufferings of various provinces with incomprehensible indifference. But these isolated instances are nothing in comparison with the state of things prevailing before him and Augustus, and renewed after his death. Enough that the emperor distinguished between good and bad officials, leaving the former in office as long as aristocratic place-hunting permitted; enough that he punished oppression, and was himself an example of disinterested administration. In the absence of public accusers, even the practice of delation, which was most complained of by the rapacious and intriguing aristocracy, was not altogether unfavourable to the provincials. As to the alleged extirpation of the Julian house, the man who had suffered most from the depravity of that house and the sinful city was least answerable for the detestable custom, prevalent among the Italian *principes*, of using poison or the dagger in their quarrels, and of instantly suspecting poison when death occurred.

It is true that the administration of Sejanus, from 23 to 31 A.D., displays real misgovernment. Indeed, after the minister had isolated the misanthropic emperor in Capri, even the provinces had the favourite's creatures inflicted on them. The emperor cynically allowed Sejanus to pillory his once honourable name for all ages by a multitude of odious practices.[1] Still the last six years of the emperor made some amends even here, except in the eyes of the Roman aristocracy and politicians of the city, who rated the character of a monarch by the amount of ceremony he paid to the farce of senatorial government.[2]

In Jewish history, Tiberius is associated with the least pleasant side of his reign, because the Jews had to thank Sejanus for delivering them up to a worthless character like Pontius. Altogether, they had been persecuted with special malevolence in his later years, for Sejanus took advantage of the proceedings against

[1] Cf. the speaking characteristic of this time, Juv. Sat. x. 56, seq.
[2] Loc. cit.

them in the capital, as related above. However, after Sejanus' death, Tiberius, whether through the influence of the Herods or of his sister-in-law Antonia, who was friendly to the Jews, resolved to recall his former edicts and make it the proconsul's duty to respect Jewish customs.[1] Thus Tacitus is enabled to sum up the condition of Judæa under Tiberius in two words: "Under Tiberius there was quiet."[2] On the other hand, the close friendship of the Herods with the imperial house laid on the little province the dubious honour of feeling every symptom of disturbance at court in its own body; every catastrophe in the palace being instantly exploited in the interest of the land beloved by the Jewish family.

It was a strange court, this, where the families of the Eastern vassals assumed a position of greater intimacy, in proportion to the impossibility of any close connection between the imperial house and the legitimist aristocracy. The Jewish princes had thus become prominent; and after real or fancied murders had cruelly thinned the family of Tiberius, we find the descendants of the murdered sons of Cæsar growing up in close intercourse with the children of the fallen Herods. The widowed mothers, too, of the last of the Julii and the Herods might have been brought together by the similarity of their fate; for there would have been something pathetic in their intercourse, had not the sons of the long-mourned victims of the old lion Tiberius and the tiger Herod already shown too clearly that feline nature which made their life more regretted than the death of their fathers.

After the fall of Sejanus, the chief places about the court at Capreæ were still held by those who had turned the scale in this momentous crisis, and outlived the years in which Tiberius had dyed his hands so deeply in the blood of his kindred. The most powerful man in the kingdom was Macro, the prætorian prefect, to whom Tiberius owed his deliverance from Sejanus. Next to him stood the aged Antonia, widow of Tiberius'

[1] Philo, Leg. M. 569. [2] Hist. 5, 9.

only brother Drusus. Her only surviving child was Claudius, who was still considered incapable of governing, and was the butt of the courtiers' wit. The question of the succession lay instead between Caius, surnamed Caligula, son of Germanicus, great-nephew of the emperor, and Tiberius, the emperor's grandson, and son of the younger Drusus, whom Sejanus had poisoned.

It would perhaps have been natural for the aged emperor to leave the crown to his grandson; but the candidate of the metropolis was Caligula. It was rumoured that Tiberius, impelled by jealousy, had recalled his father Germanicus from the scene of his glory beyond the Rhine, and then caused him to be poisoned by Piso. As a retribution, the power was not to stay in the house of Tiberius; Caius, son of the short-lived Germanicus and grandson of Drusus, was the heir desired by public opinion. A thousand Argus eyes watched over the safety of the young monster. Woe to the island king at Capreæ, as Tiberius was called by the Romans, if he touched a hair of the prince on whom their hopes were centred! Philo, indeed, professes to know that Tiberius often thought of making away with the young prince, who was dangerous to his grandfather. In spite of all flattery, his unprincipled and fantastic character had always been an object of suspicion, for while yet a child in the nursery he had shown deep depravity.[1] Be this as it may, it was the curse of the young Julii to be exploited from their youth up in dynastic interests, owing to the uncertainty of the succession. This was especially true of Caius. As a two-year-old child, his touching appearance had pacified a mutiny in the army of the Rhine. As a little boy, he had strutted round the camp in soldiers' boots, and so earned the nickname Caligula. At his father Germanicus' triumph for the most glorious campaign of imperial times, he followed immediately after his father in a chariot with his four sisters. After his father's reputed murder, he became the living memory of the people's favourite; the populace demanded him with ever new outbursts

[1] Suet. Cal. 24.

of tears; his ambitious mother exhibited him assiduously to stir up sympathy. What could he, or any boy who grew up under such influences, have become but a fool, thinking the fortunes of the whole world dependent on him, and finally taking himself in sober earnest to be a god? Even his aged great-uncle was often sickened by the inward distortion of this servile, cringing creature, who, tossed to and fro between fear of the fate which had befallen his family, and hatred of the murderer kept alight by his passionate mother Agrippina, had gone to greater lengths of dissimulation than even the impenetrable emperor. The old lion had not failed to notice that the young prince prided himself on his Julian ancestry, and despised the adopted blood of the Claudii. Tiberius even thought he perceived traces of insanity in him, while his extravagance and his exclusive intercourse with Orientals boded little good for the future. But in this case what value had the judgment of one who was credited with the death of the beloved Germanicus, and had actually killed two of his sons? The surviving son was the idol of the city, and the heir of purest Julian blood. The cry was for Caligula; and the prefect Macro, with true perception of the inevitable, admitted him to his circle in the palace.

Moreover, the grandson, Tiberius Gemellus, was an unprotected boy, with no powerful kinsman to befriend him. Under these circumstances the old emperor submitted to the will of fate, which, rumour had it, he further consulted by casting lots. Thus the wish of the sovereign people was granted; and when, on March 16th, A.D. 37, Tiberius, lying in Lucullus' villa at Misenum, quitted a detested and detesting world, while rumour whispered as usual of dark deeds, all Rome acclaimed the son of Germanicus, his undisputed accession secured by Macro's far-sighted preparations.

The first nine months after the accession of the young emperor—he was but five-and-twenty—were one long tumult of joy throughout the kingdom. It has been estimated that 160,000 victims were offered to the gods in gratitude for the

event. Even the funeral procession of Tiberius, whose mortal remains were conducted from Misenum to Rome by the young emperor, was turned into a triumphal march for the latter. Crowds gathered at every point along the road to offer up their thank-offerings and scatter incense to the new god. Everything he did or did not do in this first period was praised impartially by the fervid crowd. Even his immoderate prodigality and self-indulgence, developing under the general eye, seemed charming to a people whose capital charge against his predecessor had been his morose retirement.

Meanwhile, nature imposed stricter limits on the young profligate than public opinion. He fell ill and lay at death's door, while all Rome watched with bated breath for fear of disturbing his rest. When he at length recovered, the provinces had a new opportunity for sacrifices and deputations. But now it seemed that he had been left with an irritable, cruel, choleric disposition; while his unbridled outbreaks of animal sensuality and ferocity were so little in accord with the picture drawn of Germanicus' son, that the illness was credited with having disordered his intellect.

Still, all his early actions were approved, even his deeds of blood. The grandson of Tiberius had to put an end to his own life, as no slave might shed the sacred blood of the Julii. Roman society, however, praised the deed that freed them from the prospect of future struggles for the throne. The second victim was Macro, to whom the young tyrant owed everything. He had now become inconvenient. But this time, again, the Romans found the command of the prætorians a very dangerous office after all. Now, too, when the one mentor had gone, the other had to follow. His father-in-law, M. Silanus, who had educated him, was taught by death that his pupil had grown up. The Romans, however, were delighted once more by the abolition of family rule, for the state needed no father-in-law.

Philo, from whom these details are taken,[1] states clearly the reasons why there existed an inclination to justify the most

[1] Leg. ad Gai. Mang. 548—557.

ruthless freaks as necessities of state. After the experiences of the last century B.C., the people still shuddered at the idea of civil war and resistance to authority. The previous saviours of society had done their best to keep this onsciousness alive in the masses. The longing for peace, acting on the terrible selfishness of the people at large, had urged a surrender of his personal enemies to the prince, if only trade and traffic might go on as before, and the average man remain undisturbed. This was, above all, the view taken by the provinces, and not unnaturally, as it was a matter of perfect indifference to them how many noble Roman families had to wear the *toga sordida*. But at last the circle of sympathizers grew too large, and one province at least found the purely personal vanity of the emperor a matter of public concern, though it was the one of all others that had repeatedly offered the strongest tokens of loyalty. It was that which had once suffered most under Sejanus, the province of Judæa.

---

2. Judæa under Vitellius.

Tiberius had long held aloof from the complications of the Eastern question. Since the failure of Germanicus' mission, Sejanus and his officials had held the administration unchecked, until the emperor, in the year 35, at last sent L. Vitellius to Syria as legate with plenary powers, in order to forestal certain catastrophes.[1] Artabanus, king of the Parthians, had taken advantage of the emperor's peaceful reign to place his son Arsaces on the throne of Armenia. Tiberius at first combatted this policy of conquest indirectly, by encouraging Tiridates, a Parthian prince living as a hostage in Rome, to set up as a pretender, so as to give Artabanus occupation at home. Supported by Vitellius, who made some demonstrations along the Euphrates, Tiridates succeeded for a short time in driving Artabanus into exile

[1] Tac. Ann. 6, 32.

among the Scythians. Meanwhile this interference on the part of Rome made a Parthian war a very possible contingency. In Judæa and among the Nabatæans it seems to have been regarded as probable. In any case it was advisable to quiet the eastern provinces in order to prevent any conspiracies.

Such was the situation when the new legate entered on his Jewish administration. This time the Jews found their governor no longer inaccessible to complaints. The first victim of the change was Pilate. The motive assigned was the sanguinary suppression of the loyal Samaritans' pilgrimage to Gerizim.[1] Vitellius was met immediately on his arrival at Antioch by the complaint of the Samaritan elders concerning the ill-treatment endured by these loyal allies of Rome. By virtue of his plenary powers, he sent the procurator to take his trial at Rome, where he did not arrive until after the emperor's death (16th March, 37).[2] This summary treatment of the deposed favourites was one result of Sejanus' fall.

After appointing Marcellus to administer Judæa, the legate came to Jerusalem at the Passover of 36, to sweep away the wrongs that had accumulated in Pilate's ten years of misgovernment.[3] His first step was to depose the high-priest Caiaphas, who had so long made common cause with Pilate. Yet the city was not freed from the sons of Annas. The place of Caiaphas was filled by his brother-in-law Jonathan, and the aged Annas must have continued to direct public affairs as before. On the other hand, Vitellius granted two wishes of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, very dear to their scrupulous consciences. Not only were prices raised by the market-tolls on corn and fruit, but the food which paid tithe to a Gentile state became unclean. Vitellius was in the humour to appreciate their case, and took off the tolls. He

[1] Cf. Vol. ii. p. 123, seq. (Eng. trans.). [2] Ant. xviii. 4, 2.

[3] That it was at the Passover is stated by Josephus, Ant. xviii. 4, 3. That the year was 36, appears partly from the fact that Vitellius did not reach Syria till the summer of 35 (Tac. Ann. 6, 32), partly that the news of Tiberius' death (16th March, 37) came during Vitellius' second stay in Jerusalem (Ant. xviii. 5, 3).

likewise granted the priesthood their old prayer to be permitted to guard the insignia of the high-priest themselves, so that from this time the preparations for the feast need not begin with lustral purification of the high-priest's ornaments from the polluting touch of the heathen.[1] The priesthood showed the greatest possible satisfaction with this concession, and Vitellius could start for Antioch with the feeling that here all was secure behind him. But although the Jews loaded the proconsul with thanks for his concessions, the religious movement which filled the years 34 and 35 could hardly have been stopped by such trifling means, had not the Arabs' wholly unexpected attack on Judæa suddenly attracted the general attention to another quarter.

Events on the Euphrates had been followed with close attention at Petra, as elsewhere. As soon as Aretas, the crafty king of the Nabatæans, saw the Romans occupied in that quarter, he resolved to take vengeance on his old enemy Antipas, and extend his territories northwards as far as Damascus. So it was that Israel suddenly heard the shrill war-cry of the Bedouins on his borders. With this, the Messianic movement, begun by John and Jesus, to all appearance came to an end. Instead of continuing in the way revealed to them by the Baptist, the people were content in their own way to call the impending war a judgment for the murder of the Baptist, and so to let the religious question drop.[2] Up to this moment we have had the high tide of a universal popular awakening; suddenly the waters sink. The cause of this change was the unexpected war. This is the only explanation that can be given of the nation's sudden forgetfulness of Jesus. Their remembrance was lost in the terrors of war that burst upon them immediately after Jesus' death. If, however, the disciples of John saw a divine dispensation in the chastisement of Antipas, who did but receive just punishment at the hand of the Lord, it must have seemed an absolute dream to Jesus' disciples when they saw PILATE, CAIAPHAS, ANTIPAS—in

[1] Ant. xviii. 4, 3. [2] Ib. xviii. 5, 2.

short, all the murderers of their Lord—visited by the judgment of God in the course of a single year. "Wars and rumours of wars" suddenly resounding on every side, seemed to them the presage of the promised second advent. Not until experience told them of another war could the eschatologist make Jesus say: "Ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars; see that ye be not troubled; for these things must needs come to pass; but the end is not yet. For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom; and there shall be famines and earthquakes in divers places. But all these things are the beginning of travail."[1] At the time, therefore, when these words were written, the Church knew that this period of war was only "the beginning of travail;" but the very prominence given to it, and the warning, "See that ye be not troubled," shows that this outbreak had been taken for the beginning of the last travail. Indeed, it seemed as if it had been given to the year of Jesus' death "to take away peace from the whole earth." For besides the Roman war on the Euphrates, there soon came news of strange rebellions of the Babylonian Dispersal against the Parthian satraps, so that the Jewish world was suddenly filled with the clang of arms.[2] The storm soon passed, but in the mind of the church these years of war remained as heralds of the Lord's advent. The Apocalypse, too, refers to this epoch, following the first appearance of the Messiah on earth, as the time of great bloodshed. "And another horse came forth, a red horse; and to him that sat thereon it was given to take peace from the earth, and that they should slay one another; and there was given unto him a great sword."[3]

With regard to the war which actually visited Galilee, this religious theory of its causes was but the pragmatic view of pious souls. The aristocracy of the temple in Jerusalem were well aware that the Arabian king had seized the long-looked-for opportunity of taking revenge on Antipas for the repudiation of his daughter and the doubly adulterous marriage with Herodias,

[1] Matt. xxiv. 6—8. [2] Ant. xviii. 9. [3] Rev. vi. 4.

which was an offence to the priests and had been rebuked by the prophet of the wilderness of Judah.[1] But however the visitation might be interpreted, all had seen the red horse; seen the blaze beyond the mountain of Gamala, the red pools of blood on the battle-field of Gamalitis,[2] where the tetrarch's whole army perished in one day; and seen the great sword with which the young men of the country were slain, and the blood-stained fugitives dispersed over all Judæa. The mercenaries from Philip's former domain, seized by Antipas, had brought about the ruin of the tetrarch, by betraying their position to the Arabs.

Vitellius, however, gave up the tetrarch. Possibly he was occupied with the Parthians, and thought it inconvenient to become involved with the courts of Ctesiphon and Petra at the same time. Possibly, too, personal animosity to Antipas induced him to send for instructions to Rome before assisting the allied prince. For Antipas was odious to him as one of the imperial delators who sent information about men and affairs in the East to Capreæ direct. Pilate's hostility to Antipas may have arisen from the same cause; Vitellius, however, immediately on entering office, had become acquainted with the prince's impertinent and tactless curiosity, when he sent couriers to the emperor with his official report of the proceedings along the Euphrates.[3] On that occasion the proconsul restrained his anger; on this, in turn, he did not stir when Aretas' horsemen harried the vale of Hieromax and routed the tetrarch, although the invasion soon assumed serious proportions, and Aretas overran all Philip's former tetrarchy and finally seized upon Damascus.[4] But by this time came an angry order from the emperor to take the Nabatæan dead or alive; and as Tiridates, the ally of

[1] Ant. xviii. 5, 1.

[2] Keim, Prot. Kirchenzeitg. 1869, No. 51, prefers to read Galaditis (Gilead) in Ant. xviii. 5, 1; but the northern theatre of war had nothing incompatible with an intended co-operation with the Parthians.

[3] Ant. xviii. 4, 5. Yet Josephus is wrong in referring this letter to Vitellius' collision with Artabanus, which did not take place till Caligula's reign.

[4] 2 Cor. ii. 32; Acts ix. 25.

Rome, had forced the Parthian king to take refuge in the northern satrapies, Vitellius was at liberty to advance against Aretas with two legions and the auxiliaries.[1] But instead of engaging with the Bedouins in Trachonitis, he preferred a direct attack on Petra to force the Nabatæans to retire. With this view, he had advanced as far as Ptolemais, when he was met by envoys from the Jews, beseeching him to spare them the march through their country, as the land would be defiled by the busts of the emperor and the eagles on the standards. Whether it was fear of denunciation by Antipas, or a bid for popularity among the Jews, or consideration for the continued religious excitement of the people, the upshot was that the proconsul eventually resolved to lead his army along the coast of Gaza, while he himself made his second appearance in Jerusalem at the Passover of 37, to offer a sacrifice on his own behalf.[2]

As illegalities had occurred in the interval—perhaps the stoning of Stephen—he deposed Jonathan, the son of Annas, whom he had himself appointed high-priest the year before, and named his brother Theophilus to succeed him. He had been four days in Jerusalem when the news came that Tiberius had died on the 16th March, 37. Thereupon he declared his mandate at an end and returned to Antioch, giving Antipas the excuse that he had no orders from Caius to push forward so serious a war. Such a step, however, was only possible if Aretas had already retired to Syria. Such, indeed, was the case, according to Josephus. His flank threatened and his line of retreat nearly cut off, the Arab king had returned home by forced marches. So great were his difficulties that he questioned the augurs about his situation. They answered that the Roman army could not possibly come to Petra, as a prince would die first, either Tiberius or Vitellius or Aretas himself. The flight of the birds turned out correct. Aretas, for his part, ceased hostilities; at least nothing was heard of resuming the campaign. It also argues the restoration of peace that Caius immediately

[1] Ant. xviii. 5, 3. [2] Ib. xviii. 5, 3.

disposed of Philip's territories, which had just been seized by Aretas; and Paul of Tarsus, driven from Damascus by a Jewish ethnarch of Aretas, found it possible to return there.[1]

The consequence was that the tetrarch of Galilee had to bear all the losses of the war of 36. Altogether his fortunes set with the death of his patron Tiberius. Not only were his personal relations with the imperial house broken off, but the prospects of his cousin and brother-in-law Herod Agrippa, with whom Antipas lived in bitter enmity like a true Herod, rose with the elevation of his friend Caius. The first disagreeable result of the new state of things reached him in the intelligence that the adventurer Agrippa had secured the dominions of Philip, on which every member of the family had cast a covetous eye since the year 34. The relations of Judæa consequently assumed an entirely new character, as Vitellius also was recalled, the more abruptly perhaps as he had fulfilled his mission brilliantly. Tiridates, indeed, had been unable to maintain himself in the kingdom of the Arsacids, and Artabanus rapidly re-established his supremacy while Vitellius took the field against Aretas. So the proconsul had to cover the Euphrates once more, supported by his vassal princes. But Artabanus was not in a position to undertake a struggle against Rome, with his weakened power. He held an interview with Vitellius upon a bridge thrown over the Euphrates, and settled to give up his sons as hostages, and sacrifice to the Roman ensigns and the bust of Caligula—a humiliation never before submitted to by an Arsacid.[2]

Once more Antipas took the opportunity of asserting himself, putting up a tent on the bridge at great expense, in which he entertained the Parthian and Roman grandees.[3] But this inopportune activity availed the Jew as little as his exemplary

[1] Gal. i. 17; 2 Cor. ii. 32.

[2] Dio, 59, 27; Suet. Vitell. 2; Calig. 14; Galat. i. 17.

[3] This conference between Vitellius and Artabanus takes place in the reign of Caligula, according to Dio Cass. lix. 27, and Suet. Calig. 14; wrongly under Tiberius, according to Jos. Ant. xviii. 4, 5.

administration availed Vitellius. The valiant proconsul, whose achievements were greeted with unanimous admiration,[1] was recalled so ungraciously by Caius that he imagined he was returning to his death. Arrived at Rome, he flung himself in oriental fashion at the feet of Caligula, in order to save his life; vowing to offer him innumerable sacrifices if his life were spared. The crafty soldier had not miscalculated. The young Cæsar's vanity was touched by the servile adulation of the most renowned official of the late reign. He admitted the man whom he had recalled in such a hostile spirit to the inmost council of his oriental friends, where, indeed, he had to accommodate himself to a continuance of oriental flattery.

Thus Antipas had in the closest intimacy with the emperor an adversary who had never forgotten his interference in the administration. The same intimacy was enjoyed by another enemy, his brother-in-law Herod Agrippa, who played the same part as informer to his patron Caligula that had made Antipas influential with Tiberius. The natural consequence was the fall of the "fox" tetrarch.

---

3. Herod Agrippa.

After the death of Tiberius, it was the caprice of the new Cæsar to shuffle the destinies of the nations. Judæa was flung piecemeal to an adventurer now past the meridian of his life—a man who now, after a career of sycophancy, crime, treachery, and gluttony alternating with prison fare, was to end by playing the honourable part of a king of Jerusalem. Herod Agrippa, this last great king of the Idumæan dynasty, was withal a remarkable figure of his time. His character, destitute of virtue or consistency, made him sufficiently pliant and malleable to be at once Cæsar's confidant and the favourite of the Pharisees.

[1] Suet. Vitell. 2; Tac. Ann. 6, 32; Dio, 59, 27.

His petty arts as go-between and negociator succeeded in diminishing the friction between Rome and Jerusalem, and deferring for a while the outbreak of the inevitable conflict. In this rôle he accomplished what better men would perhaps have attempted in vain.

Herodes Marcus Agrippa, named after Augustus' great minister, was born in the year 10 B.C.[1] He was the second son of the prince Aristobulus, one of Mariamne's two sons, by whose execution the elder Herod put the crowning touch to the tragedy of his family life. His widow Bernice settled in Rome with her children shortly before Herod's death, for the founder of the dynasty thought it politic to add the princes of his own house to the company of landless scions of royalty, who at this time thronged the court and formed the nobility whom the new empire set off against the unfriendly aristocracy of the capital. The hope of returning to their native land as *reges socii* made these dispossessed strangers the devoted servants of every new power, and kept most of them in the capital till the end of their lives, when they bequeathed their hopes and claims to their children.

In this circle a prominent part was played by Bernice, her two daughters, Herodias and Mariamne, and her three sons, Herod, Marcus Agrippa and Aristobulus, so that Strabo had a high opinion of them.[2] Bernice's intimacy with Antonia, wife of the elder Drusus and daughter-in-law of Tiberius, brought her family into the inmost circle of the imperial house. Her sons grew up with Drusus, the son of Tiberius, and with Germanicus and Claudius, the sons of Drusus and Antonia; the hopes of a great future lay before them. The Roman world naturally viewed this friendship of the young Cæsars with dislike. Indeed, the aristocracy may have had some reason to declare the Herods responsible for implanting the ideas of

[1] This is clear from Ant. xix. 8, 2, which places his death (44 A.D.) in his fifty-fourth year.

[2] Geog. xvi. 2, fin.

oriental despotism in the young princes and accustoming them to oriental servility.[1] On the other hand, the young Herods learnt little good from their Roman friends. Although the two mothers, Antonia and Bernice, were celebrated on every tongue as models of noble matrons, a spirit of overweening arrogance ruled the immediate circle of the princes. The younger Drusus, Tiberius' son, was with Agrippa a passionate admirer of gladiators; he set them to fight with sharp swords, named Drusian in his honour; and showed such pleasure in their sports that Tiberius was charged with letting his son follow his inclinations in order to render him detested.[2] It afterwards happened that the prince boxed the ears of the minister.[3] In revenge, Sejanus seduced his wife Livilla, and with her help removed the son of Tiberius by poison. Germanicus, who was Herod Agrippa's senior by five years, pursued his brilliant career beside the ambitious Agrippina the elder, in his glorious campaign on the Rhine. Claudius, on the contrary, gained an evil reputation for indolent sensuality, and passed for a pupil of the gynæceum.[4]

The sons of Herod, too, were not in the best repute. Agrippa was a spendthrift; his sister ran away from her husband, exchanging Herod Boethus, who claimed to have been designated king of the Jews by his father, for his brother Herod Antipas, who had the power to make her a queen.[5] In the radius of her own world, such adultery was an every-day occurrence; but on the banks of Jordan, where she fled with her infant daughter Salome, she was to come into conflict with prophetic utterances which recognized another standard of conjugal fidelity. After the death of their mother Bernice, things went from bad to worse. The brothers fell to quarrelling and brawling. Agrippa aimed at equalling the Cæsars' extravagance and follies; but the son and nephew of Tiberius had command of resources far beyond those of the richest Herod, and before

[1] Dio, 59, 24; Strabo, 16, 2.
[2] Ann. 1, 76; Dio, 57, 13.
[3] Ann. 4, 3; Dio, 53, 22; 57, 14.
[4] Dio, 60, 2.
[5] Bell. i. 30, 7; Ant. xviii. 7, 1; cf. Vol. ii. pp. 67 and 114 (Eng. trans.).

long Agrippa was heavily burdened with debt. As long as he was a friend of the imperial house, it mattered little; the day of reckoning would only come when the emperor gave him one of the Syrian tetrarchies. But unfortunately Drusus fell a victim to the poison of Sejanus in the year 23, and Tiberius, in order, as he said, not to be reminded of his loss, forbade the court to the companions of his dead son.

None was so hard hit by the decree of the royal hypochondriac as Agrippa, whose creditors began to dun him unmercifully. Now, too, began at Rome the troubled times of Sejanus' sole rule, which lasted till the year 31. Antonia's son Germanicus had died young, like his father; his widow, the passionate Agrippina, entered upon a fierce struggle with Tiberius that was destined to end with her own ruin. His alarm roused at her intrigues by Sejanus, Tiberius retired to Capreæ. It was against her followers, C. Silius, Sosia Galla, Calpurnius Piso and Claudia, that the emperor's first murderous decrees were issued.[1] The death of the empress-mother Livia in 29, deprived Antonia's family of its last protecting hand. Agrippina was publicly insulted, degraded, blinded of one eye and exiled to Pandataria, where she died. Her son Nero put an end to his own life at Pontia; her other son, Drusus, was starved to death in the dungeons of the palace.

Sejanus fell at length in the year 31; and at the same time Livilla's share in the murder of Drusus came to light. The only concession Antonia could win from her brother-in-law was that her daughter might be starved to death in the palace in order that no further public disgrace should be heaped on her house. The only one she succeeded in saving was her grandson Caligula; but she had already had occasion to realize the brutal nature of the last son of Germanicus long before Rome suspected what a ruler was growing up for them in the women's quarter of the palace.

While Antonia was thus wrapped up in her own sorrows,

[1] Tac. Ann. 4, 20. 52; 5, 3.

Herod Agrippa was carrying on a desperate struggle against his creditors. Even the property of his wife Cypros, another Herod, was not enough to keep him afloat; nothing at last remained for him but to take ship for Palestine with his young wife and children. With the joyless intention of burying himself in solitude, he sought out the most lonely of all lonely spots in Palestine, and retired to his hereditary castle of Malatha, in the south of Judæa, opposite the Dead Sea, an old and miserable township which at most enjoyed an occasional Roman garrison to protect it against the Arabs.[1] There, amid barren chalky cliffs, where the eye at best rests on the unlovely form of grey olive-trees or scanty groups of palms, he brooded over his varied life in the capital. Neglected by his boon companions, hard pressed by his creditors, a prisoner in dreary Malatha, his fate seemed darker and darker. He had already resolved to make an end of his life, when his wife, the pious and lovely Cypros, came to his rescue. She wrote to her brother-in-law, Herod Antipas, pictured the sad condition of her once brilliant husband, and persuaded him to invite the latter to his new residence at Tiberias.

Thus Agrippa appears in his brother-in-law's capital at the beginning of the thirties. Antipas had founded Tiberias in honour of his patron Tiberius, and built it with all the splendour that imperial architecture could devise, on the beautiful banks of the lake, that lay, a blue mirror among golden hills, facing the snowy peaks of Hermon. But the people viewed the statues with exasperation. Their marble limbs were the first things to be dashed to pieces when disturbances broke out. The Rabbis, too, pointed indignantly at the unclean soil of the ancient burial-ground which had come to light in the course of the building.[2] The far from friendly disposition of the Baptists towards the neighbouring court can be seen even in the Gospels, although Tiberias is not named in the Synoptics. It is the retinue of this court, then consisting of Antipas and Herodias,

[1] According to Robinson, Pal. iii. 182.

[2] Ant. xviii. 2, 3; Jos. Vita, 9, 12. 13; Bell. Jud. ii. 21, 6.

their widowed daughter Salome, Herod Agrippa and Cypros, Helkias and Aristobulus, to which belong the people in silken raiment, who are called "Benefactors," according to Jesus' expression, and to whom the disciples may leave the invidious question of precedence.[1]

It was popularly supposed, also, that John the Baptist's death had been compassed in these gilded chambers, and that here Jesus was held to be that prophet risen from the dead.[2] At best it was not the abode of happiness, and Agrippa had a niggardly patron in Antipas. A small revenue was settled on him, and after the model of Rome, where the nearest relations of the sovereign did not think it beneath them to accept municipal offices, Agrippa was appointed agoranomus of the capital Tiberias. The former playfellow of the Cæsars had to fulfil the duties of an ædile, to superintend the market, sales and purchases, weights and measures, the price and quality of goods, order and propriety in bequests—assuredly no small labour in the busy fishing life beside the lake, such as we know it from the Gospels. But his humble office, important in a great city, ridiculous in a vassal-town, Herodias' pride and Antipas' insolent reproaches soon made unendurable. At a feast at Tyre his brother-in-law once more jeered at him coarsely for a beggar; whereupon he took his departure and went to Antioch, where his friend Flaccus was still in office and the stern régime of Vitellius had not yet begun.[3]

Pomponius Flaccus had been consul at Rome while Agrippa was still in his glory, revelling with the young Cæsars, but had enjoyed the pleasures of court longer. Tiberius had appointed him proconsul of Syria at a deep drinking bout. He received his old comrade kindly, although his brother Aristobulus, with whom Agrippa had quarrelled, was already living at his court. The brothers immediately renewed their quarrel even here, and this time Agrippa was worsted. In his pecuniary embarrass-

[1] Mark x. 42; Luke xxii. 25. [2] Mark vi. 14.
[3] Ann. vi. 27.

ments, he sold the people of Damascus his influence with Flaccus. His brother exposed him, and the proconsul renounced his friendship.[1]

Under these circumstances, Agrippa was compelled to seek new protection. He had no further expectations in the East, so in the spring of 36 he turned his eyes once more towards Italy, where Antonia had been restored to favour, and altogether better times had dawned since the fall of Sejanus. But when he had actually started, he fell short of money. He therefore sent on his faithful freedman Marsyas to raise the necessary funds on any terms. At length in Ptolemais a sum of 17,500 drachmæ was handed over to him, advanced by the *libertus* Petrus on a bond for 20,000, and that only from attachment to Bernice and confidence in Antonia. At last he was on the point of embarking at the most southerly harbour, Anthedon, when the news that Agrippa once more had funds induced Herennius Capito, governor of the crown domain of Jamnia, to arrest him on board ship till the debt of 300,000 sesterces he owed the emperor's son should be paid. The claims of the Treasury, indeed, took precedence of all others, and had the privilege, so to say, of a lien on the debtor's property.[2] So the voyage to fortune was threatened with disaster at its outset. Agrippa professed his readiness to pay, cut the cable by night, and slipped off to Alexandria. Here the alabarch Alexander, Philo's brother, advanced him a large sum, out of compassion for his wife, the lovely Cypros. The Jews, too, would possibly find it well worth while to have an advocate at court in view of the growing hostility of the Greeks. There was some fear, however, of further difficulties such as had been raised by Capito. He therefore received but a small sum down; the rest he was to receive at Puteoli. So husband and wife parted. Cypros returned to Judæa; Agrippa intended to try his fortune again at court. These were the closing days of the old misanthrope Tiberius, and he seldom quitted his island. But he received the Jewish

[1] Ant. xviii. 6, 2. [2] Cf. Bachofen, Röm. Pfandrecht, i. pp. 232—265.

prince kindly; and the latter thought himself out of all his difficulties, till next day a despatch came from Herennius Capito telling how the Herod had eluded his creditors. Thereupon Tiberius forbade him the court till he had paid his debts. But Antonia came to the rescue; she advanced the necessary sum, and now Tiberius permitted a reconciliation. In these last days of the emperor there could have been no superabundance of useful courtiers, for Tiberius was soon induced to appoint Agrippa tutor to his grandson, Tiberius Gemellus, afterwards assassinated by Caligula. The boy's life being in jeopardy, he probably intended to give him a worn-out guardian rather than a good tutor. But Agrippa, with the true instinct of the adventurer, attached himself by preference to Caligula, who found in him a bold flatterer such as his vanity required.

The ædile of the Galilean township had now once more become a person of distinction. At this juncture appeared a good Samaritan in the person of the freedman Thallus of Sichem, who advanced him a round million to discharge the debt to Antonia. By this time Agrippa imagined he would be able to unseat his brother-in-law Antipas by all manner of calumny; but the latter was more firmly established than he thought, and the charges failed. Tiberius, instead, was inwardly dissatisfied that the man he had appointed to be guardian of his grandson was inclining to his great-nephew. Already suspect, it only needed a slight impulse to push him from his high place. Happening to be out driving with Caligula, then twenty-four years of age, he expressed a wish to his young friend that the old man would soon make way for him at the helm. The wish could not possibly refer to Tiberius Gemellus, who was only sixteen. The driver Eutychus—perhaps the man to whom Caligula afterwards gave two millions in his cups[1]—overheard the suspicious wish, but held his tongue. However, as he held Agrippa in the hollow of his hand, he thought he might pilfer somewhat more boldly than usual in his master's house, till Agrippa was provoked into

[1] Suet. Calig. 55.

bringing him to justice for the theft of a cloak. Once in court, the coachman demanded to be led before the emperor, as he had important revelations to make to him. Meanwhile the emperor, whom age made even more retired than he was by nature, would hardly have bestirred himself to hear the coachman's secret, had not Agrippa, in terror of the emperor's caprice, pleaded for pardon through Antonia. The emperor, who was staying among the Alban hills, had the prisoner brought to Tusculum, and received his secret. Fact or fiction, Josephus' story gives a lively picture of life at the court of the misanthropic emperor. The old man murmured, "Put him in chains;" Macro, however, the prefect of the Prætorian guards, neither knew which one he meant, nor dared inquire. So he put the coachman in irons, and the prince went to table. But when Tiberius met the Jew in the circus, he was furious and had him arrested. Robed as he was in a purple toga, with a wreath on his head, Agrippa was placed in the castle court-yard. Here he got a draught of water from a slave by promising to redeem his liberty; and a soldier of the German body-guard interpreted to him the flight of birds.

Now while Herod's grandson was making acquaintance with the life of the Prætorian barracks, Tiberius had returned to his island, where he fell sick of a slight illness. In the first months of the year 37, he set out once more in the direction of Rome, to deceive the people about his condition. But his last lie cost him dear. He stopped to rest at Misenum, and in the villa of Lucullus meditated setting his house in order. Once more he was confronted with the choice—Caligula or Tiberius? The balance of reasons had not altered; chance must decide. Superstitious by nature, and a fatalist like all tyrants, he left the choice of his successor to the decision of the gods, resolving to appoint the one who should first greet him on the next day. Seldom has a late breakfast been fraught with such weighty consequences as that of the prince Tiberius on the fatal day. When the emperor's door was thrown open in the morning, Caligula entered. Tiberius then burst into lamentations over

the fate of his grandson, but dared not oppose the gods. Soon after, he had a relapse, and no one else was permitted to enter the palace. One morning—it was the 17th March, 37—as Agrippa was being led from his guard-house to the bath, his freedman Marsyas came hurriedly to him and whispered in Hebrew: "The lion is dead." Agrippa was jubilant, and promised his servant boundless gratitude if the news were confirmed. The centurion, too, approached; wished all happiness to the favourite of the new Cæsar; struck off his chains, and set about preparing a banquet forthwith. At the height of their merry-making came a messenger with the news that the emperor still lived. The centurion now felt the edge of the sword at his own neck; he sprang up madly, put Agrippa once more into chains, and reflected how he could excuse himself to Macro. But the same thing had happened to the prefect of the Prætorians in the palace. All had gone to pay their respects to the new sovereign, when they were terrified to death by the news that Tiberius had revived and asked for something to eat. Then came the message that this time the emperor was really dead. It was rumoured that, after his unseasonable recovery, Macro, the prefect of the Prætorians, had suffocated him with pillows and cushions.[1] A few days later, the new emperor sent for his old friend and boon companion to the palace, providing him with new clothes and a barber. Then he set a diadem on his head and named him king of Philip's eastern tetrarchy, which had been vacant since the year 34, as well as the former dominions of Lysanias in north-eastern Palestine.[2] The senate was bidden to decree him prætorian honours;[3] and, as a personal token of favour, Caligula added a golden chain, made exactly on the pattern of the one he had born in captivity.

Great as was the jubilation in Rome over the son of Germanicus, there soon arose grave shakings of heads in the oriental city, which Caius still retained as a royal residence. "Nothing

[1] Tac. Ann. 6, 50. [2] Ant. xviii. 6, 4; Dio, 59, 8.
[3] In Flaccum M. ii. 523.

caused so much anxiety," says Dio Cassius,[1] "as the conviction that Caius' cruelty and debauchery were on the increase, especially on receipt of the news that the kings Agrippa and Antiochus were in his company to initiate him deeper into the art of despotism." The same historian compares his generosity to Agrippa with his cruelty to Tiberius Gemellus, who was executed without delay at the end of the year.[2] It is not unjustifiable to suspect that the tutor, Agrippa, himself recommended the assassination of his former pupil.[3] The youth, now aged seventeen, was led into a room, surrounded by soldiers, and told that he must die. He offered his neck; but a sword was put in his hand and he was told the place to strike. Such was his tragic end. The tyrant soon followed this up with the death of Macro, his own and Herod's benefactor; while he forced his own father-in-law Silanus to cut his throat with a razor.

Thus all on whom the better part rested their hopes were got rid of. The court of eunuchs was once more torn by rival factions. The Jews, for their part, raised bitter complaints against the influence of Egyptian and Phœnician courtiers, such as the actor Apelles, a certain Cynædes from Ascalon, the Egyptian astrologer Apollonius, and the Alexandrian wit Helicon, not to mention a host of other Egyptians whom Philo credits with the habits of crocodiles and serpents of Nile.[4] The fact is, Rome feared the influence of these inferior lackeys far less than that of Agrippa, the object of Philo's commendation.[5] The latter, indeed, remained in the *entourage* of the emperor till the summer of 38. He therefore took part in all the follies and crimes which belong to the first period of the new régime; so that if Caligula may be held irresponsible by reason of a brain overtaxed by illness and insomnia, a double share of blame attaches to the Jewish adventurer who, in cold blood and with full responsibility, assisted in the frenzied transports of a mad-

[1] 59, 24. [2] Dio, 59, 8.
[3] Keim, in Schenkel's Bible-Lexicon, 3, 50.
[4] Leg. 556 M; Dio, 59, 29. [5] Dio, 59, 8; 24.

man. His stay at court witnessed the death of his own pupil, the execution of Macro and Silanus, and finally the fall of his patroness Antonia, who paid with her life an attempt to bring her grandson to reason.[1] At last Agrippa found it prudent to visit his kingdom beyond Jordan, and embarked on his homeward voyage in the second year of Caligula. His voyage is noticeable for the grave injury he did the Jews of Alexandria by a tactless visit. Escorted by the scornful laughter of the Alexandrians, he came, in the autumn of 38, to Julias, his capital and residence, on the Lake of Gennesareth.[2]

This spendthrift by profession had come to the best administered of the tetrarchies of Judæa. The country between the lakes and Damascus, formerly decried for its wildness and the thievish character of its inhabitants, had been cleared of robbers by Herod I., and had begun to flourish again under the mild rule of his son Philip. The government during the interregnum seems also to have been perfectly orderly. We see Jesus and his disciples pass unmolested from one market-town to another, where in earlier days plundering shepherds and Bedouins had shared the government. It was not till the year 36 that the "red horse" rode through the country, scorching and burning, thanks to Antipas, whom the Bedouins had chastised, and who now, after his defeat and his last spasmodic efforts to put himself forward in the Parthian war, was fruitlessly searching for some means of commending himself to Caius. He accumulated arms in order to play a more important part in the next war than his power permitted; he had coins struck at the imperial mint bearing, instead of the former Jewish emblems, this inscription of devotion and flattery: "To Caius Cæsar Germanicus Augustus."[3] But this was the last money he coined. The attempt of this Galilean frog on the banks of Tiberias to swell

[1] Dio, 59, 3.

[2] Ant. xviii. 6, 11. According to Philo, in Flacc. § 5, Mang. ii. 521, he started from Rome at the time of the ἐτησίαι, or periodic winds.

[3] Cf. Keim, in Schenkel's Bible-Lexicon, 3, 46; Eckhel, 3, 487; Cavedoni, p. 60.

himself out to the size of the Roman ox, ended at last as Æsop foretold. Even the 70,000 stand of arms he had stored up in his arsenal, and the ridiculous position of mediator he had assumed between Parthia and Rome, were to bring about his destruction. For what was the object of such precautions on the part of a tetrarch unless he feared ruin? As it had been Herodias who ruined his position among his people, who made him murder the prophet, and urged him to undertake the Arab war, so once more it was she who gained him an exile's grave. Her ambition could not brook to see her brother, who had once sat a beggar at her table and acted as superintendent of the market at Tiberias, now sovereign of the tetrarchy on which she had long cast a covetous eye, sharing with her the possession of the lake over which her flag alone had waved till now, and, worst of all, bearing the title of king, while her husband was only tetrarch. When at the feast of Tabernacles at Jerusalem in 38, Antipas and Herodias found that, instead of playing the first part as before, they were completely eclipsed by the entry of the "king" in his splendid chariot, Herodias conceived the firm resolve that Antipas should follow Agrippa in seeking his fortune at the court of Caligula.

This was little to the taste of the tetrarch. Craft, suspicion and prudence, were his fundamental characteristics. When he once sought the life of Jesus, the prophet exclaimed, "Go and say to that fox, Behold, I cast out devils and perform cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I am perfected." In one point at least Antipas was like a fox; he was unwilling to go to Rome. He saw many footprints leading into the lion's cave, and few leading out again. But his wife left him no peace, and great preparations began. Then his brother-in-law, Herod Agrippa, began to grow suspicious. He might well imagine that some blow was to be dealt him at court, and sought to forestall it. Knowing the ways of the court better than his brother-in-law, he promptly despatched his freedman Fortunatus with letters to his friend Caligula, accusing Antipas of conspiracy,

once with Sejanus against Tiberius, and now with the Parthians against Caligula,—a charge which received some countenance from his entertainment of Artabanus and Vitellius on the bridge, especially as his arsenals were in a state of extraordinary preparation.

In the summer of 39, Antipas arrived safely with Herodias at the warm baths of Baiæ, where Caligula was then astounding the world with new escapades. He had been told that Tiberius' astrologer had re-assured the old emperor about the fate of his grandson with the words, "Caius will no more be emperor than he will drive his chariot-horses over the sea at Baiæ." Stung by this, the "god" commanded a practicable bridge to be built over the bay of Baiæ, 3600 paces across. He impressed all the merchantmen bringing corn from Sicily and Egypt—thus causing a temporary famine in Rome—and with these ships built a bridge of enormous breadth, covering them with an embankment of earth, which he paved like the Appian Way. He opened the bridge by driving across to Puteoli arrayed as a victor, a chaplet of oak-leaves on his head and a battle-axe in his hand. The next day he returned in triumph in his car of victory. At night he gave a banquet, at the end of which he set his guests afloat on the sea, and ran their craft down with his beaked galley. The noise and confusion were indescribable; he, however, found it no small source of gratification that even Neptune had trembled before him.[1]

The course of these humane enjoyments was interrupted by the audience with the tetrarch Antipas. The Jew and his excellent wife were courteously received by the "god," although the Jews offered active resistance to the worship of his genius. But in the course of the interview—so cunningly had Agrippa contrived it—the letter of complaint came into the emperor's hands. Caius read it quietly, and then calmly asked Antipas if he really had purchased arms for 70,000 men. The tetrarch

[1] Suet. Calig. 19, 32; Dio Cass. 59, 17; 18. Before the journey to Gaul in the autumn of 39.

was unable to deny the fact; whereupon the emperor considered him convicted, and sent him away from the audience to exile at Lugdunum in Gaul. He was inclined to show mercy to Herodias as the sister of Agrippa, but she—the sole redeeming point in her life—preferred to share the exile of the husband she had ruined. When, not long afterwards, the emperor transferred his residence to Lyons with a view to the spoils of Gaul, husband and wife were sent on to Spain, where, according to the other account of Josephus, they died.[1]

Unlike them, their daughter Salome was restored to her high position by the turn of fortune. She married Aristobulus, son of the king of Chalcis, who in the year 55 became king of Lesser Armenia through the favour of Nero, while portions of Greater Armenia were added to his dominions in the year 60.[2] Under Vespasian, too, we find a Herod, doubtless their son, king of Chalcis, when fortune had long forsaken all other Herods.[3]

The kingdom of Antipas, on the other hand, fell to Agrippa, who now united Galilee and Peræa to the dominions of Philip and Lysanias. Apparently he at once applied pressure to increase his spoils by Jamnia and Livias, the basilicate governed by his enemy Herennius Capito. At any rate, after Antipas fell by treachery, Agrippa's closest friends whisper of embezzlement committed by Capito.[4] The latter saw himself threatened with an inquiry which at all events facilitated a change of government, and perhaps entailed a lease of the district adjoining Agrippa's lands, or possibly, considering Caligula's boundless prodigality, even the annexation of Livia's inheritance. To forestall the intrigues of his Jewish neighbours, the threatened financier endeavoured to destroy the proofs of his frauds by stirring up political commotion, ruthlessly lighting the flames of religious war if he might but escape in the confusion.

[1] Bell. ii. 9, 6; Ant. xviii. 7, 1; 2.
[2] Ann. 13, 7; 14, 26; Ant. xx. 8, 4.
[3] Bell. vii. 7, 1.
[4] Philo, Leg. ad Gai. Mang. ii. 575.

4. Cæsar-Worship.

The Roman religion had from the outset been intimately connected with the powers on which the welfare of the state depended. The worship of Jupiter Capitolinus did not represent the Greek's bright god of heaven, but the lofty thought of justice and political order, the invisible supreme head of the republic. Under the name of the supreme god of the state, the celebration on the Capitoline regarded the state itself.[1]

The logical result of this view of religion was that similar veneration was paid to the genius of the monarch after the establishment of the empire. The more closely the weal and woe of the realm were connected with the Julian dynasty, the more the sense of dependence directed itself to the genius of this house. It would therefore be unjust to brand Cæsar-worship as an abject form of blasphemous flattery.[2] Were there not other grounds for doubting the strength of the sense of dependence at the time, the worship of the emperor's genius could only be recognized as the necessary adaptation of Roman religious thought to the new position of the state. For the Deity, or *numen*, always presents itself to the Roman as a specific individual, a *genius*. Every one has a genius, who accompanies him through life and shares his joys and griefs. After his death it joins the number of the domestic Lares or Manes, which, turned into subtle and beneficent spirits, remain as Penates to watch over the safety and welfare of the house. Granted that the weal and woe of the realm were closely connected with Cæsar's genius, and that the maintenance of public order depended on him, religious veneration of him was of course a duty. Cæsar-

[1] Pfleiderer, Relig. ii. 162, 170.

[2] The worship, for example, of the gentle M. Aurelius was perfectly honourable, and lasted after his death. In Diocletian's time his statue still stood amongst the Penates of most houses, and was regarded as the chief author of oracles. Rer. Aug. Scr. M. Ant. 18.

worship was servility only so far as all worship had become an empty form. Doubtless towns and public bodies and individuals outdid each other in the abuse of religious forms, in order to evince their loyalty by building temples of Cæsar and Augustus. Considering that in earlier times the provincials tried to win the favour of their proconsuls by erecting temples to their genii—considering, too, that the senate had committed itself to equal devotion towards Cæsar[1]—Cæsar-worship now became the religious expression of acquiescence in the monarchy.

At first Augustus resisted this innovation, and in the capital actually melted down the silver statues which had been dedicated to him. Still—and this was far more significant—he permitted the dedication of a temple to the *Roma Dea* in conjunction with the genius of the Julii or his own name. As he now represented the state just as Jupiter once represented the republic, he suffered the vassal princes to ascribe to him the attributes of Jupiter Capitolinus, as an expression of the manner in which the state was connected with him.[2] In this sense, as religious homage paid to the monarchy, Cæsar-worship now became legalized. Immediately after the death of Augustus, his worship was organized by Tiberius in person. Twenty-one senators chosen by lot, together with Tiberius himself, undertook the priesthood of the Augustan college.[3] At the same time, temples were also built to the genius of the reigning emperor, while eleven cities in Asia contended for the privilege of being the centre of

[1] Cic. Ad Att. 5, 21; Suet. Oct. 52, 81; Dio, 44, 6.

[2] Suet. Oct. 52; Jos. Bell. Jud. i. 21, 7. In Horace also as Hermes, Od. i. 2, 40, seq. The point of view comes out clearly in Od. iii. 5:

"Cælo tonantem credidimus Jovem
Regnare; præsens divus habebitur
Augustus adjectis Britannis."

Or in Ovid, Metamorph. 15, 858:

". . . . Jupiter arces
Temperat ætherias et mundi regna triformis.
Terra sub Augusto: pater est et rector uterque."

[3] Tac. Ann. 1, 54.

his worship.[1] These temples enjoyed more inviolable right of asylum than even the most ancient sanctuaries,[2] while a whole class of harassing indictments for *lèse majesté* attached to this institution. Still even Tiberius regarded this worship in its proper light, as a religious expression of political duty owed by the individual to the state and the monarchy.

It was reserved for the imperial madman Caligula to direct the worship to his own person, by identifying himself with the state and inventing crack-brained theories as to what extent God's chosen ruler of mankind was God rather than man—a demi-god at least, if not entirely divine. Distracted and fantastic of old, he had been nicknamed Caligula Armillatus, and so forth, from the eccentricities of his dress.[3] As he became more and more penetrated by consciousness of his own divinity, his military boots and womanish bracelets gave place to the emblems of deity. Rome itself had idolized him from his youth up, and accustomed him to regard his Julian blood as no common fluid. The consequences of his ill-considered education now began to appear. The first symptoms of approaching insanity were his speculations on the profound question, how the virtue of sovereignty came to be mysteriously implanted in individual families. Scorning advice and instruction, he used to say the spirit of sovereignty was secretly prepared in the very womb or workshop of nature, and servile souls with their counsel might keep aloof from him to whom nature had bequeathed the united wisdom of Augustus and Agrippa.[4] Before long, these speculations quitted metaphysics for theology. Could he, reflected the emperor, to whom the attributes of Jupiter had been transferred, he who on a hundred inscriptions was named God's vicegerent (*præsens divus*) or "august providence" (Σεβαστὴ πρόνοια), really

1 Tac. Ann. 4, 55—57.

2 Philostr. Apollon. 1, 15.

3 Suet. Calig. 52: Armillatus in publicum processit. Hence, according to Hitzig, the villain Armillus among the Jews: Targ. on Isaiah xi. 4; cf. Hitzig, Daniel, 125, and Hist. Isr. 583.

4 Leg. ad Cai. 553, 554.

continue to be called a man? In his opinion, the destiny for which nature had formed him was the care of mankind; but, as he used to say, the goat-herd is not a he-goat nor the shepherd a ram; both belong to a higher order of creation. In the same way the sovereign of the world stands by his very nature above the world.

No sooner had flattery discovered the weak point of the son of Germanicus, than there sprang up a universal rivalry of adoration.[1] The whole world was prostrate at his feet; the smoke of sacrifice mounted unceasingly to heaven; for him, pæans were sung and hecatombs slaughtered, and oaths began to be taken in his name. Thereupon the first year's insanity comes to a head; the god appears complete. He is no longer content to have sacrifices offered to his statue in the Cæsareum; he thinks it more august to snuff the odour of sacrifice himself as *numen præsens*. Round him press the crowd with their prayers and vows and incense. The other gods are deserted; all throng to the god who now flings pieces of gold among his worshippers or cuts off their heads. Then he proceeds to indulge his grotesque habit of clothing himself in the emblems of the deity. To begin with, he was content to appear as a demi-god on public occasions. The lion-skin and club proclaimed him as the new Hercules; the sailor's cap, as the third brother of Castor and Pollux. Then he appeared as Liber with ivy and thyrsus. Soon he advanced from demi-god to god absolute. He showed himself to the crowd as Neptune with his trident, or Apollo with a nimbus. Holding his bow and arrows in the left hand, he dispensed his gifts with the right, while trained choirs sang him the pæan. Poltroon as he was, he appeared as Mars, his splendid valour attested by the Rhine and the North Sea. Equally astonishing was his appearance as Hermes. Wings were fastened to his shoes, which, since his illness, suited ill with his soaring ideas; while winged cap and herald's staff proclaimed the heaven-sent messenger of the gods.[2] Finally, the goddess of love could

[1] Dio Cass. 59, 26.

[2] Leg. ad Cai. Mang. ii. 556, seq.

not escape his imitation,[1] though we are not told whether he displayed his charms as Amathusia, Urania or Genetrix.

It is not as if mere Jewish hatred had invented these wild stories and spread them abroad in scorn and ridicule of Cæsar-worship; Suetonius draws essentially the same picture as Philo. "He was dressed and shod," says the historian, "neither like a Roman nor a citizen; never like a man, and sometimes not even like a human being. He often showed himself in public in a brightly embroidered and bejewelled pænula, with long sleeves and bracelets, sometimes in silken robes and women's clothes. Sometimes he went in strap-shoes and cothurni, sometimes in the half-boots of the soldiers of the guard, sometimes in women's slippers. Often he was to be seen with a golden beard, and in his right hand the thunderbolt or trident or caduceus, veritable emblems of divinity: he went so far as to let himself be seen dressed up as Venus. He wore the triumphal insignia constantly before his campaign, and sometimes Alexander the Great's armour, which he had disinterred from the hero's grave."[2]

The cost of the emperor's self-deification fell first of all upon the pagan cults themselves. The splendid temple of Apollo at Miletus was given over to his genius. Then he made the senate build him a temple at Rome; and when this failed to satisfy him, he undertook in person the erection of another on the Palatine Hill. For this, the noble statue of Olympian Jupiter was to be brought over from Greece, and the menacing head of the cloud-compeller replaced by the mad boy's ridiculous grimace. But news came that the ship destined to convey the freight had been struck by lightning, and the very statue uttered a scornful laugh as soon as any one approached it. Even Caligula shrank in terror before such prodigies, and went no further in the matter.[3] Castor and Pollux instead had the honour of welcoming him as a third in their brotherhood, when he converted their temple into an ante-chamber of the palace by means of long

[1] Suet. Calig. 52; Dio Cass. 59, 26. [2] Suet. Calig. 52.
[3] Dio, 59, 28; Suet. Cal. 22.

colonnades—three fine pillars of which are still standing at the lower end of the Forum. He loved to stand thus between the figures of the brothers, where his creatures used to greet him as the third of the Dioscuri, or as Jupiter Latiaris. He devoted himself energetically to elaborating a most involved and subtle rite, to be followed when victims were presented in his temple. A standing image of him in gold was daily to be clothed in exactly the same garments as he himself wore; rare creatures, flamingoes, peacocks, heathcocks, guinea-fowl, black Egyptian geese and pheasants, were to be offered to his genius. Finally, he aspired to marriage with Luna. On the nights when the moon's disk shone in full splendour, he invited her with due ceremony to share his couch.[1] Vitellius, who since his recall had to buy off the royal disfavour with double flattery, was on one such occasion asked by the emperor if he did not see the goddess in his embrace. The crafty old hypocrite, however, cast his eye modestly on the ground, and said with trembling voice: "You gods alone, sire, are granted sight of one another."[2] The emperor, too, profited by this defect in the human organization when he declared he had found all manner of ordinances in Olympus. "Kill me, or I will kill thee," he cried in Homer's words to Zeus, whom he accused of usurping the Capitol,[3] and who might be glad if the visible god condescended to share with him. Indeed, he flung a great bridge across the Velabrum and the temple of Augustus, so as to secure a passage aloft to the Capitol, where he used to pay his neighbourly visits to Jupiter Capitolinus. From this time on, his insanity showed itself more and more in these forms. Not only were his sleepless nights spent in going to and fro along the corridor leading from his temple on the Palatine to that of Jupiter on the Capitol, or in holding wild converse with Luna; day saw him whispering to the image of Jupiter, holding his ear to the mouth of the Thunderer, nodding, laughing, shaking his head or chiding, according as he shared his colleague's views or not. Then he had

[1] Suet. Cal. 52. [2] Dio, 59, 27. [3] Suet. Cal. 22; Dio, 59, 26.

thunder-and-lightning machines constructed, and when a storm came on discharged his artillery to outdo Jupiter Pluvius. Yet storms caused him such terror that he cowered under his bed; and when from Messina he saw Etna in flames, he was so terrified that he hurriedly took his departure from Sicily.[1]

If such scenes stood in glaring contrast to the adoration he demanded, much more did the sins which he offered shamelessly to the general view, justifying them strangely enough by his divinity. One revolting aberration of his was to live in incest with all his sisters; but he appealed to the example of Jupiter, and his sisters thus participated in his godhead. Apamea in Bithynia has coins stamped with the inscription, Diva Drusilla, Julia, Agrippina, beside his effigy. The official oath ran: "I hold nothing dearer than Caius Cæsar and his sisters."[2] When Drusilla died, she was raised to the rank of universal goddess. A senator testified that he had seen her ascending to heaven. Whoever engaged in festivity or business on the anniversary of her death, was punished. For the future, the emperor himself swore only "by the godhead of Drusilla."[3] Of his other two sisters he grew tired. First he handed them over to his friends, then banished them to Pontia and Pandataria. Instead, he now required similar honours for his wife and child. He made Cæsonia ride beside him armed as Minerva, while his friends had to regard her as a nymph. He laid his infant daughter Julia Drusilla on the lap of Pallas, and proclaimed her as a new incarnation of the Julian godhead. The fact that the child soon began to scratch the faces of other children, gave him especial assurance of the purity of the divine blood.

The condition of the empire being what it was, the emperor-worship everywhere ripened rapidly under this exaltation of madness. Officials and municipalities one and all vied with each other in temples dedicated to the emperor. No resistance was offered in heathen lands; but the attitude of the Jews was all

[1] Suet. Cal. 51.
[2] Suet. Cal. 36; Dio Cass. 59, 11. 26.
[3] Suet. Cal. 24.

the more suspicious. Not only did they refuse to take part in the required worship, but they could not endure their country to be polluted with such abominations. Fierce conflicts were inevitable, particularly where Jewish cities had a considerable Gentile population. Although the Jews had so far been successful in avoiding pagan altars, they were now forced to learn that it was easier to turn the back on an altar of Jupiter or a temple of Apollo than on the altars of the sovereign. In the year 39, a conflict of this sort broke out in the Philistine town of Jamnia, claimed by the Jews as a Jewish town with the old name of Jabneh, but regarded by the Syrians as common ground. Jamnia had been included in Salome's inheritance. There, a Pharisee, like all the women of the Herod family, she had spent her old age in the society of dignified Rabbis, so that she has come to be singled out as founder of the Rabbinical school of Jamnia.[1] She had bequeathed the city, together with her other domain in the valley of the Jordan, to the empress Livia; and at the time we are speaking of, this basilicate was governed by Herennius Capito in the name of the Roman fisc.[2] Now whether the Rabbinical school of Jamnia was of so early a date, or whether we only see the consequences of the bigoted Salome's pharisaic reign[3]—the fact remains that the Jews of the city were very sensitive on religious matters, and may have had good reason for murmuring against Herennius Capito. He personally was an enemy of the Jews, and had already let Herod Agrippa feel the aversion he felt towards the stubborn people.[4] Under the patronage of the Roman government, the Syrians had consequently made repeated attempts to break down the privileges of the Jews. They now heard from strangers they met in the ports that altars were everywhere being raised to the genius of Cæsar. The opportunity of turning the tables seemed as favourable as could be. They hurriedly erected an altar of lime and bricks and other

[1] Derenbourg, Palestine après les Thalmuds, p. 210.
[2] Cf. Vol. ii. p. 53 (Eng. trans.); Ant. xviii. 2, 2; 6, 3, 4.
[3] Ant. xvii 2, 4. [4] Leg. ad Cai. M. ii. 575; Ant. xviii. 6, 3. 4.

sorry materials, solely in order to secure the opportunity of destroying Jewish superiority. Of course the Jewish party instantly pulled down the imperial altar, whereupon Capito, eager to curry favour with the emperor—so necessary, the Jews whispered, against the day of reckoning—sent in a report of the *lèse majesté* committed by the Jews. His immediate intention was only to draw the sting of a definite complaint from his district, which Agrippa doubtless would have had great pleasure in lodging. But this report was to deal a heavier blow to the Jewish land than its author could have desired.

Meanwhile the heathen population of Alexandria also had prepared the same weapon to strike at Jewish prosperity, so that from this moment battle was joined along the whole line.

---

5. Persecution of the Jews in Alexandria.

In the latter years of Tiberius, the restless mart of Egypt had been in as peaceful a condition as could be permitted by the antipathy between Egyptians, Greeks and Jews.[1] The province itself was a model of the good order unconditionally demanded of his agents by Tiberius. The governor, Avilius Flaccus, was depicted even by his bitter enemies, the Jews, as a clever, prudent, taciturn official, who kept down the rising aristocracy of trade, sternly repressed the riots in the city, and in the spirit of his master hunted down the unlawful societies which were credited with the pursuit of political ends under cover of religion. The ordinances were reasonable, the valuation-lists fair, the discipline of the troops unimpeachable; and as Flaccus protected trade, and at the same time showed the innumerable sophists of Alexandria his interest in their studies, he had succeeded in satisfying this motley population. Even the Jews called him clever and good, a man well-pleasing to Israel, until the last of

[1] Cf. Strabo, Geog. 17, 1; Philo, In Flaccum, Introd.

his seven years of office, when they discovered that he was a monster risen from hell.[1]

There is not the slightest doubt that from the day on which he received the news of Tiberius' death (which occurred on March 16th, 37), he adopted the exact contrary of his former course. Flaccus had belonged to the party of the old empress Livia, who was held responsible for the banishment of Caligula's mother, the widow of Germanicus. On this account he had combated Caligula's succession and contended for the superior claims of Tiberius' grandson. When, however, Caligula came to the throne, he felt that his fate was sealed. As soon as news came of the death of the young Tiberius, closely followed by that of Macro, he gave up the struggle for life, and in gloomy despair let things take their course. On the death of the stern ruler, a doubly firm hand would have been needful to curb the Alexandrians; but the proconsul had but one pre-occupation, to prevent any conflict that might draw upon him the notice of the emperor or lead to a complaint. But the loudest shouters of the agora, certain corrupt scribes and sophists, with the instinct for disorder native to professional demagogues, speedily discovered that their time had come. Flaccus, once so unapproachable, and grown grey in honour, lived to see the day when the "recognized leaders of the mob" said boldly to his face: "Tiberius Nero, in whom lay thy hopes, is dead; so is Macro, thy support; thou hast but one advocate left, the people of Alexandria." Such promises of protection from a province to its governor were not indeed without parallel. Lentulus Gætulicus, for example, had been menaced in the same way by Tiberius, whereupon he intimated that he would make use of the means offered by his province, and was left unmolested.[2] So Avilius Flaccus might resort to the same means. A compact, as Philo thinks, was arranged in express terms: the Alexandrians were to intercede for their proconsul, and in return he was to sacrifice the Jews to them. But it was very unlike a Roman

[1] Philo, In Flacc. M. ii, 517.

[2] Tac. Ann. 6, 30.

official to promise any dereliction from duty in so many words, while it is obvious that the extent of Flaccus' guilt was limited to withholding protection from the Jews and allowing the Alexandrians to do as they pleased.

Moreover, the conflict was not precipitated by the plots of the agora, but by provocation on the part of the Jews themselves. The immediate cause of the renewal of this acrimonious racial war was the ill-judged visit of Herod Agrippa, the Jewish king. He had left Rome for his new kingdom in the summer of 38.[1] It was the practice for newly-appointed officials to repair to their provinces by the most direct route. If they were compelled to journey through other provinces, respect for the local governor required that they should in no wise exceed their private station, nor stay longer than was necessary. The reasons for this practice were patent to all but Agrippa. Mistrusting the sea even at the best season, he had provided himself for the journey with a broad-bottomed merchantman of Alexandria, which brought him into the harbour of that city instead of Ptolemais. The Jews of Alexandria would break out into noisy demonstrations if the new king showed himself in their midst; but this was no reason for Herod to continue his journey incognito. In spite of the strained relations in the city, his vanity would not permit him to refrain from flaunting his royal title where he had once been known as no better than an adventurer and a turncoat. The rest can be easily imagined, though Philo tells us more about the consequences of the Jews' behaviour than of the actual proceedings.[2] His Jewish majesty was at once clamorously greeted by the innumerable inhabitants of both Jewish quarters. Their "Marin! Marin!" (i.e. Lord) filled the air. A crowd of excited Jews rushed shouting down every street, in a tumult of petulant self-glorification and noisy indiscretion. Then came the dazzling array of Agrippa's motley suite, weighed down with silver shields and gilded arms and trappings

[1] For the chronology, cf. Keim, Jes. of Naz. i. 273, 308 (Eng. trans.)

[2] Lib. in Flacc. M. ii. 521, seq.

in a general rivalry of flaring colours, so that the Jews were convinced that their king entirely eclipsed the splendours of the proconsul. The proconsul himself and his friends could not make up their minds whether the affair was no more than a Jewish indiscretion, or whether there was some deeper reason for Caligula's notorious boon companion to come out of his way to Alexandria, and make such a demonstration by entering a place where the Jews were at the moment in need of supreme discretion.

Nevertheless, Flaccus received him with the courtesy due to the emperor's favourite, but it was impossible to screen the Jewish king from the very unflattering cries in which Apion's fellow-countrymen gave vent to the feelings aroused in them by the deafening enthusiasm of the Jewish quarter. When Agrippa visited the gymnasium and other splendid buildings, he found himself pursued with every kind of contumely, which was far from being calmed by the Jews' indignant demand that Flaccus should use force to suppress these discordant voices. The heads of the Jewish community, the alabarch, with whom Agrippa was lodging, and his brother Philo, and above all the king himself, could see in the natural consequences of their own mistake nothing but the result of shameful intrigues on the part of Flaccus, for they had no idea what violent provocation a Greek community found in the pomp and ceremony of a Semite procession such as this. Indeed, after the previous quarrels and Apion's long years of persecution, there was no need of the caballing suspected by the king and his friends, to bring about a catastrophe. It is almost self-evident that Agrippa did not conceal this view of his Alexandrian experiences from his imperial patron. The sudden removal of Flaccus in the autumn of the same year may perhaps be connected with the insinuations of the insulted prince.

But, after all, Agrippa's vanity stirred up trouble he had not foreseen for his fellow-countrymen in Alexandria. Even after his departure the demonstrations continued. The next

day certain Hellenic mischief-makers seized upon a half-witted creature named Carrabas, well-known to the whole city, for he used to run naked to and fro, and the boys took advantage of his good-nature to lead him into all manner of pranks. They put a mantle of rushes on his shoulders, crowned him with a papyrus-leaf, and put a reed in his hand for sceptre. The lads marched before him with staves as a body-guard, and in this manner led him through the Jewish quarter; while the crowd unceasingly raised the cry of "Marin! Marin!" with which the Jews had greeted Agrippa two days before. Once more the latter were indignant that Flaccus did not send the garrison to make short work with the crowd, or at least fling the half-witted Carrabas into jail. At last they resolved to take the law into their own hands, and proceeded to violence. Thus began one of the great frays which were not uncommon in these mixed cities. In the midst of it, some malicious spirit inspired the multitude with the Satanic thought of carrying the new statue of Cæsar, now the universal object of sacrifice, into the synagogue. Thereupon the struggle instantly assumed the most dangerous proportions, especially as Flaccus did not find himself called upon to take away the emperor's statue—an act, indeed, which he could only have ventured upon at the risk of his life. The Jews might carry through the contest which they had brought upon themselves. Maybe, Agrippa's insinuations lost their sting when Rome received news of the fruit his visit had borne; maybe, it even won the grace of the god Caius to find a worshipper of his godhead in Flaccus as well as Vitellius. In any case, he quietly watched the course of events.

The Jews, too, may not have been so absolutely innocent in respect to the affray as Philo makes out, for he himself cites an edict of Flaccus laying the blame of the offensive procession on the Jews, who perhaps expected a new national era from Agrippa's report of his imperial friend. It is impossible, more-over, to judge how far the Jews were justified in acquirir[ng] business premises and dwelling-houses outside the two Jew[ish]

quarters. Anyhow, the signal was given to plunder the isolated Jewish houses,—the persecution breaking out at the very moment when the Jews had closed their shops in loyal mourning for the death of the emperor's sister Drusilla.

Still Flaccus held back; instead of intervening, he required the Jews to confine themselves to one quarter only, so that they were forcibly dispossessed of more than four hundred houses.[1] The remaining quarter was utterly insufficient for the double population. The evicted Jews built themselves unhealthy huts in the districts subject to inundation from the canal, the only place open to them. They sought shelter in public buildings and tombs, some even retiring to the catacombs and sewers.[2]

But the mob were no longer satisfied with sacking the deserted Jewish houses; the Jews' ships were plundered when they came into port; Jewish labourers were driven from the wharves, and if a Jew showed himself in any Gentile quarter, a hunt for life ensued. Moreover, the Jewish quarter proper suffered severely, for business was at a standstill and loans were not repaid, as might be expected where the borrowers had taken part in the riots.

After things had gone so far, there was an end of security for the pledged and chartered privileges of the Jewish religion. The proconsul proposed to put an end to the Jews' freedom from public business, citations and the like, on the sabbath. For this is the period to which belongs the imperious utterance of a nameless proconsul, told in Philo's second book of Dreams. He lays down the law to a Jewish deputation as follows: "If you were assailed by a hostile army, by a flood or fearful storms, earthquakes or other such natural calamities, would you celebrate the sabbath in your usual idleness? Certainly not. You would have done with all your fancied scruples; and strain every nerve to save yourselves, your wives and your children, and secure your goods and chattels. Now listen to what I have to

1 In Flaccum M. 531.

2 According to In Flaccum M. ii. 525, seq., and Leg. ad Cai. 563.

say. I am your war, your flood, your pestilence and earthquake, and the rest; in a word, I am your evil destiny, and will compel you to act according to my will and carry out my commands." Indeed, peace could not be thought of so long as Flaccus was unable, even if he wished, to secure the Jews' sanctuaries; but as it is clear, in spite of Philo's silence, that the Jews met force with force, the proconsul thought fit to institute proceedings against them. Thirty-eight ringleaders were punished by the lictor in the circus without any of the customary formalities of justice. Others were broken on the wheel; others, again, crucified as rioters. On the pretext of seeking for arms, domiciliary visits were begun; even women were haled before the tribunal. When nothing could be proved against them, they were ordered to eat forbidden meats in proof of their loyalty. Enraged as the women were by this ill-treatment, the times of the Maccabæan war were over; they listened to reason, ate the meat, and returned home. But few were obdurate, and paid for their pride with life or health.

The excitement of the unequal strife lasted for week after week. If a Jew was espied, he was stoned to death and his corpse dragged through the streets. Fresh houses belonging to Jews were continually discovered and fired, or a great bonfire was made of the furniture, and the inhabitants flung into the flames.[1] To crown all, the magistrates lent the mob the aid of their troops as soon as the Jews' resistance began to be at all effectual. Now while Flaccus thus neglected his duty and sacrificed the Jews, he was sure of escaping any complaint on the part of the Alexandrians, whose noisiest orators took the lead in the riot. On the other hand, for security against the Jews, he did not officially apply for the testimonial which the Jews had put in his hands as another means of defence, but sent his successor-designate, Manius Maximus, an account which laid the whole blame of the riot upon the Jews.[2]

Meantime, the removal of Flaccus had been decided on before the bitter cry of the Jews had reached the ear of Caius. Either

[1] M. 526. [2] In Flacc. M. ii. 527.

Agrippa's story had already produced its effect, or Caligula's vengeance on the opponent of his claims had now ripened. At the feast of Tabernacles in the year 38, the Jews learned with joy that during the night the proconsul had been arrested by the centurion Bassus at the express command of the emperor. An odious trial then began, in which the voluble champions of the agora lied their deepest against the prisoner, and appeared unblushingly as the accusers of the man whom they had used for the basest ends during the last few months. Finally, the proconsul was relegated to Andros, where, according to Philo, he shed repentant tears in the woods and valleys, crying in despair to heaven: "Lord of men and gods! Thou dost then care for the fate of the Jews, and they lie not when they say they have Thee to protect them!" His agony of remorse was only put an end to by the assassin sent by Caius.

Meanwhile, the inadequate disgrace of Flaccus gave no relief to the Jews of Alexandria. The new proconsul was no more disposed than the old to remove the statue of Caligula from the synagogue, where it had been placed by the mob. The Jew-baiting took a new start after the lull which followed the arrest of Flaccus. The trees in front of the synagogues were cut down; the buildings themselves were fired. The vast chief synagogue, however, was consecrated as a temple of Caius by means of a colossal statue in bronze. To this end a bronze four-horse chariot was dragged from the theatre of Cleopatra and placed before the image, so as to add a general air of dignity. The Jews maintained that the outrage was unparalleled since the foundation of the city three hundred years before. They made a representation to the proconsul: it was mere insult to the emperor's majesty for the Greeks to dedicate a chariot, a woman's vehicle, to a man, and to offer the god an old and sorry team. The Jews of Alexandria were loyal; the proconsul, however, might consider that disloyalty and ingratitude to God would be followed by disloyalty to the emperor. It was not in the interest of the common weal that a whole section of the community

should be morally ruined after having always done good service to the empire.

But the only thing obtainable was the despatch of an embassy of five elders[1] to Caius, with Philo at their head. The Greeks immediately appointed a delegation of their own, with Apion for spokesman.[2] This was perhaps the occasion on which Apion gathered up all his abuse of the Jews into a book. Its second part dealt with their aggressions in Alexandria, and laid down the proposition that toleration of them in the kingdom ought to be made dependent on their participation in the Cæsar-worship.[3]

Both parties, then, had sent their natural representatives; the only fear was lest the god at Rome should lend a more favourable ear to Apion's travesties than to the religious reasonings of the gentle Philo. For rumour hastened to say that Caius was filled with the religious zeal of the Alexandrians. He was dissatisfied with the new temple in the second city of the empire, especially as he was fool enough to believe in the honesty of Alexandrian adoration. It was even said that he meditated transferring his seat of government to the midst of his faithful Alexandrians.

Arrived in Italy, the envoys soon discovered that for the time being the emperor preferred news of Alexandria to every other form of reading. They discovered, too, that the numerous Orientals of his court were doing their utmost to irritate him against the Jews. Mediator there was none; no one was inclined to approach the emperor with reference to his fixed idea. The deputation had to make up its mind to interview the emperor in person, and give him a list of grievances arising out of the occurrences in Alexandria, a more detailed account of which Herod Agrippa of course had already provided. They succeeded in handing over the document to the official on duty at the moment when Caligula came out of the gardens of Agrippina.

[1] Leg. ad Cai. 572.
[2] Ant. xviii. 8, 1.
[3] Jos. Contra Ap. 2, 6.
[4] Suet. Cal. 49.

They even received the assurance of being admitted to an audience without delay. With this purpose the Alexandrians followed the emperor to Puteoli, where he was staying. Philo gives a vivid picture of the scene: the Jews sitting day by day beside the lovely bay of Naples, and gazing sadly upon Capri or across the sea, while they awaited the longed-for summons to the madman's audience-chamber. But Caligula sets out for Gaul without giving the invitation. Instead, there suddenly appears one day a Jewish messenger, distraught with fear, scarce able to speak for tears and grief, and with difficulty stammering out the words: "The temple is lost: Caius has given orders to set his statue in the holy of holies." He was soon followed by others who confirmed his dreadful news. It was Herennius Capito's report from Jamnia to which the Jews owed this unlooked-for turn of events.

The message which Philo had to lay before Caius had now gained quite another complexion. Instead of the synagogue of Alexandria, the very existence of Judaism seemed at stake. For Philo saw Israel's superiority to other nations shaken by the attempt to produce disloyalty to God. He saw the door opened to every heathen vice, for the law must fall with the temple. Here it were well to make a stand. The aged philosopher united the spirits of all the prophets in his breast. "The Lord," he cried to his followers, "wishes to prove if this generation of Israel can bear as much as its ancestors. Our people has undergone severer trials; God will bring us through this too." But they were not destined to go down like their fathers into the level plain of Sephela and fight against the heathen. Their battle-field was to be the polished mosaic of the palace-floor; there they were to submit like fools to the insults of a flock of courtiers, who could not understand why people refused to worship the emperor as divine, when he had expressly declared this to be his will and pleasure.

It was not until the end of August, 40, when Caius had

returned from his German campaign, as it was called,[1] and affairs had developed considerably in Judæa, that Philo at last succeeded in obtaining the longed-for audience upon the affairs of his native city. Instead of meeting them in the senate, as the envoys had ventured to hope, the emperor received them in his own villa (between the gardens of Mæcenas and Lamia, which he had thrown into one), in the presence of the keepers of the garden. Apion, too, and his colleagues were there by appointment, so that the spirit of ridicule which ruled the assemblage was thoroughly worthy of the Egyptian wit. Caius' lackeys had no sense of the dignity with which Philo's lofty character rose above the Egyptian jester.

When the emperor entered, the envoys fell down before him; whereupon Caligula asked them, with a scornful laugh, if they were the people who would have nothing to do with his divinity; adding blasphemies which Philo cannot bring himself to repeat. Their Alexandrian adversaries immediately took the opportunity to accuse them, not only of refusing to erect altars to the emperor, but also of neglecting to sacrifice for the emperor's welfare. Philo retorted that, on the contrary, the Jews had thrice offered hecatombs for the emperor's welfare; first at his accession, then on his recovery from illness, finally for his Germanic victories. "But you did not sacrifice to *me*," interrupted Caius, "but to another God. What did that profit my godhead?" As for the Jews, their blood froze in their veins to hear such blasphemy; but Caius did not wait for an answer. He was already in the next room, remarking on its deficiencies, while his court enjoyed the comedy of mocking the envoys. "Suddenly," says Philo, "he came back to us, and asked in his most earnest tones why pork was forbidden to us." At this question, Apion's friends burst into such extravagant laughter that their breach of etiquette brought down a rebuke upon them, and Philo reminded them that the Egyptians were in the

[1] In Leg. ad Cai. 598, the envoys appeal to the fact of having sacrificed in honour of the victory over the Germans in the year 39.

same case, since mutton in its turn seemed unclean to other nations. "They are right; it has a vile flavour," was the royal answer. But now, as soon as the philosopher prepared to deliver a wider defence, the emperor went on from one room to another, and ordered the light from various windows to be softened with clouded glass, meanwhile putting in several questions; but without waiting for an answer, he was off again to the next room, where he had to order some painted tables. Weary, exhausted and hesitating, the Jews prayed God in their hearts to save them from the power of this false god, for they could only believe they would finally be condemned to one of the emperor's atrocious fighting-matches. But Caius was in the lofty mood of merely pitying his opponents. "These men are not so much wicked as unfortunate and foolish, not to know that my nature has in part become divine." Such was his decision. He dismissed Philo without punishment, yet without answer. Persecution continued in Alexandria; the alabarch himself, Philo's brother, was imprisoned.[1] This seemed to decide the racial war; Apion's ridicule had won the victory over Philo's profoundly religious personality. But the decision lay in Jerusalem, not Alexandria. The struggle there had already taken such tragic form that Philo's mission to Rome was forgotten even by the Jews.

---

6. The Attack on the Temple.

If the standard of political prudence could in any way be applied to the acts of Caligula, it would be impossible not to feel astonishment, quite apart from religious reasons, at the rashness shown by the new Cæsar in stirring up trouble for himself on the Arab frontier. Yet his predecessor had purchased contentment in this province with great concessions, and the Pax Romana had been in a critical condition ever since Aretas'

[1] Ant. xix. 5, 1.

invasion of Damascus two years before. However, to make the statues of the emperor the ground of quarrel with the Egyptian Jews, of all people, seemed almost an insult to their proverbial servility, the continual scorn of the Alexandrian Greeks. Besides, the bolt fell from a cloudless sky. Caligula's repeal of his predecessor's edicts against associations had been taken by the Jews as a favour to the congregations of the synagogue.[1] Peace with Rome never seemed to them more secure than at the moment when Galilee and Peræa received a king who seemed, as the emperor's dearest friend, to be the very pledge of Rome's favour to the Jews. The general opinion that they possessed no common patron in the friend of the Herods, is clearly shown by the hecatombs which the priests of Jerusalem offered in honour of Caligula's recovery.

In the year 39, orders reached Petronius at Antioch to detach three legions from the army of the Euphrates,[2] and occupy Judæa. He was to set up in the temple at Jerusalem a statue of the emperor bearing the inscription, "Zeus, the manifested, the new: Caligula." P. Petronius, descended from an ancient and honourable house whose name went back to Etruscan times, had been proconsul of Asia under Tiberius. On the recall of Vitellius, he succeeded him in Syria. Trained in the school of Augustus and Tiberius, he had very different ideas as to the duties of the army. He learned with grave misgiving that Cæsar Caligula put half the army of the east at his disposal in order to desecrate a temple, to rouse anew a nation that was scarcely pacified, and to let loose upon the weakest frontier of the empire that most monstrous of all wars, a religious war.

Under these circumstances, Petronius determined to use no excessive haste in carrying out his orders. Although his fear of the Jews, and various contingents from the Euphrates and the Ghettos of Asia Minor, cannot have been so great as Philo persuades himself, his sense of justice was undoubtedly outraged by the thought of such an outpouring of blood for so puerile a

[1] Dio, 60, 6. [2] Ant. xviii. 8, 2.

cause. On the other hand, the emperor's orders could not be neglected, especially as war against the Jews was by no means unpopular in Antioch itself. But as there were no orders to take up an old statue with a new head to Jerusalem, which would have occasioned a double insult to the temple, and might very possibly have been taken in bad part by the emperor, Petronius first commissioned one of the bronze foundries of Sidon to make such a statue as was required.

In the autumn of 39, he actually marched to Ptolemais with two legions[1] and a great number of auxiliaries. Here he went into winter-quarters, and summoned the high-priest and the rulers of the temple to inform them in a friendly way of the emperor's commands. The high-priest Theophilus, son of Annas—doubtless, too, the aged Annas himself and the other members of the high-priest's house—appeared in Ptolemais; but the proposition awaiting them here could receive but one answer, whether from Sadducee or Pharisee, Hellenist or Hebrew: "Only after our death." When the news of the outrage spread as of itself throughout the Holy Land, the plain of Phœnicia would not hold the multitudes of Jews who poured down from every valley and covered the inhospitable country. City, town and hamlet, were left desolate in Galilee and Judæa. What were the shields of Pilate, the eagles of Vitellius, or the plunder of the Corban, compared to this plan, which seemed the fulfilment of what was written in the Book of Daniel concerning the last days, the abomination established in the holy place? The pilgrim host spread over Phœnicia like a cloud. The inhabitants of Ptolemais thought their hearing endangered by the desperate outcry of these hot-blooded suppliants. Ranged in six columns—old women, matrons and girls; old men, the middle-aged and boys—the host at length drew up before the proconsul's palace. The proconsul appeared on the balcony; every eye was cast to the ground, amid cries of lamentation and mournful gestures. Bidden to draw near, the elders approach, dissolved in tears, their heads strewn

[1] Two, according to Ant. xviii. 8, 2; three, according to Bell. ii. 10, 1.

with dust, and their hands behind their backs. With endless volubility they unfold the whole story of their loyalty, their obedience to Vitellius, their sacrifices and prayers. They offer all their worldly goods as a free gift to Caius, if the temple may but remain as it was handed down by their fathers.

The sight of this defenceless people in supplication made a deep impression on Petronius and his suite. He could not indeed venture to authorize a direct petition to Caligula. But he tried to delay active measures still longer, so as to give opportunity for indirect mediation. While urging the artists in Sidon to act on the maxim, "What waits long is good," he withdrew from the Jewish multitudes, who returned home anxiously.

It was unwillingly, and with half-uttered curses on the god in Rome, that he resumed the distasteful affair in the beginning of 40. At the time of the spring-sowing, we find him at Tiberias, the residence of Herod Agrippa. The king himself had once more disappeared from the scene. He had reached Rome without compromising himself with either side.[1] Aristobulus, his brother and absolute antithesis, and Helkias the elder, second husband of his mother Bernice, came instead, with other Jewish princes, to meet the proconsul most resolutely. Soon the whole valley of Gennesareth was as full of men as the plain of Ptolemais the year before. Petronius' question, whether they wished for war, was answered by the cry "No! but death." The proconsul may have counted on the urgency of tillage, as he was careful to choose the precise season of spring-sowing for his advance; but he was disappointed in his calculations. For forty days before, all work had stopped; no field was tilled; famine was certain in the autumn. But the multitude remained before Tiberias, and wept over their temple. At last the Roman yielded so far to the entreaties of Aristobulus and Helkias as to determine on a new report to Caius. The pretext was flimsy enough, but still it afforded an excuse. Petronius had heard that Caius was meditating a tour in the autumn through Egypt and Pales-

[1] Ant. xviii. 8, 7; Dio, 59, 24.

tine. Now the proconsul thought it would be scarcely pleasant for the emperor to find a famine in these provinces. The Jews, however, were a most perverse race—so much so, that they were neglecting their sowing on account of the temple. The proconsul therefore begged for new instructions as to the manner of dealing with them. If meantime he received no orders to the contrary, he would proceed as soon as the statue was completed in a manner worthy of the emperor.

Thus further delay was gained. The proconsul went back to Antioch;[1] the Jews returned home. They greeted it as a good omen that abundant rains enabled them to make up for lost time in cultivating their fields. Still the strain of expectancy remained; all looked to the west for the news the next ship might bring. Caligula was in Gaul at the time. On reading the despatch, he burst out furiously, and at first threatened to lay the governor's head at his feet.[2] Reflecting, however, that Petronius was at the head of the army of the Euphrates, he calmed his fury with the thought that the statue would at last be ready at Sidon. Affairs, therefore, came to a standstill; all the more because Caligula, eager to follow in his father's footsteps, was engrossed in his campaigns against Britain and Germany.

Caius' real reason for going to Gaul was to find a new opening for plunder, now that he had squandered all the treasures amassed by Tiberius. By the autumn of 39, he crossed the Rhine, and conducted the memorable sham-fight in which the Germans of his body-guard played the part of the German nation and were utterly defeated by him, a victory for which the senate granted him a triumph. He passed the winter at Lyons, laying the Gallic nobility under contribution, and selling off the old furniture of his villas by auction before the lictor. Early in 40, he marched to the north of France with an army of 250,000 men, in order to cross over into Britain. But instead

[1] Bell. ii. 10, 5.

[2] So Philo; otherwise in Josephus, xviii. 8, 8. But Philo was nearer to the occurrences, and Josephus contradicts his own chronology.

of venturing on the passage, he collected a few sea-shells, declared Poseidon vanquished, and marched back again. On August 31st of the year 40, his birthday, he entered the capital in triumph. Now he was free to resume proceedings against the Jews.

This time the principal task fell to Herod Agrippa. If being king of the Jews and the emperor's friend, on both of which he plumed himself, were worth a doit, the duty and responsibility of avoiding this conflict lay with him. There was now actually some talk of a petition drawn up by Philo, and presented by Agrippa.[1] On the other hand, the audience with his old friend which the king sought, after so long an absence, came near having a fatal termination. The emperor uttered fearful threats against the Jews. At the first thunders of the god, followed by one of the grimaces which, Suetonius tells us, he used to practise before a glass in order to terrify mankind, Agrippa was wise enough to fall into a deep swoon. Perhaps it was only to escape the necessity of offering the customary adoration. Philo, indeed, draws a vivid picture of how the emperor's boon companion lay unconscious for thirty-six hours, and came to, thinking himself still in the presence of his terror. But whether the swoon was real or feigned, it was certainly to his advantage, for Caligula was reconciled by this overwhelming effect of his personality, and the good understanding of former days was restored, to the great chagrin of the Romans.[2]

A new petition was now sent by the invalid, a clever composition, according to Philo's analysis. The writer recalls the honour shown to the temple by Augustus and Agrippa, the protection given by Tiberius against Pilate's inroads. Even the edicts of the divine Augustus are brought into line, a testament from which no Cæsar willingly deviates. In this way the writer represents the emperor as entreated by emperors, Caius Cæsar by the Cæsars, the grandson by his ancestors. Finally, there is the appeal from the friend: "Thou hast freed me from

[1] Leg. ad Cai. M. 572. [2] Cf. Dio, 59, 24.

chains of irons; wilt thou rivet others on me, which gall the conscience?"

No such document is known to the later Josephus. He makes everything proceed still more theatrically. As a sign of renewed favour, the emperor accepts an invitation to Agrippa's, when the king exhausts his ingenuity in devising a banquet that shall be unsurpassed in costliness of viands, in changes and surprises of every kind. Even Caius Caligula was enthusiastic over his friend's noble entertainment. With his usual majesty, he bade Agrippa ask a favour of him. Thereupon Agrippa, with the deepest humility, begged the emperor to excuse his foolish countrymen from setting up his statue in their temple. Caligula bit his lip, but granted what circumstances forbade him to refuse. So says Josephus. In either case, this turn of affairs could not be the end.

Caligula's inclinations were still divided. Instead of lifting the burden from the heart of his people, he ordered Petronius to leave the temple indeed untouched, but to prevent no one from erecting chapels to Cæsar outside the city. Any one assailing one of these newly erected sanctuaries was to be sent to Rome for punishment. Naturally every enemy of the Jews now built altars, not to honour Cæsar, but to annoy the Jews. The priests found themselves in the most curious dilemma. If the desecrators of the land were left in security, the people would grow accustomed to the abomination, and the desecration of the temple would only be a matter of time. But if resistance were offered to this outrage on the country, Caius might be expected to punish them by revoking his former concessions. Indeed, a report was current that the emperor was having a new statue got ready in Rome, now that the one in Sidon was done with, and that when he honoured the east with his presence, he meant to strike a sudden blow and erect it in the temple. Hence it came about that, despite the concessions in Jerusalem, Jewish persecution continued in Egypt, with the aim of gradually converting all synagogues into temples of the emperor.

According to Josephus, correspondence on the subject must have been kept up with the Syrian government till the last days of the tyrant. For Petronius, as a punishment for preferring the presents of the Jews to the emperor's will, received the task of selecting the penalty of his disobedience. However, before this last command came into the hands of the proconsul, the news reached Palestine that Caligula had been assassinated and buried in the very gardens of Lamia where he had so shamefully mocked Philo and his fellow-envoys.

His insanity had advanced with rapid strides in the last few months; but the reign of folly was not put down until its terrors spread from relatives and rivals to freedmen and soldiers. Before this, even his grandmother Antonia, on attempting to bring Caius to reason, was met with these reassuring words: "Remember, it is permitted me to act in any way and against any person." Once, while walking between the two consuls, he suddenly laughed out loud. The lords politely asked why he laughed, and received this answer: "I was thinking that any moment I could have your heads cut off." He kissed the beautiful neck of the amorous Cæsonia, his fourth consort (the second and third he had only taken from their husbands, to send them off again as soon as might be),[1] with the complimentary jest, "Even this fair neck I might cut off."[2] One day the people in the circus gave their plaudits to the wrong side; he cried out in a rage, "Would that they all had but one neck!"[3]

Winged words like these there were innumerable—too often followed by winged deeds. He declared that at the next change he would make his horse Incitatus consul; and the Romans believed him. Meanwhile, Incitatus was treated like a nobleman. He had a villa, and a body-guard, who saw that he was not murdered in his sleep; he dined at the same table with the senators; Caligula swore by his life and fortune, and pledged him in a golden cup. If the Cæsar had lived longer, Incitatus would have been invested with the honours of the Fabii and the

[1] Suet. Cal. 25. [2] Ibid. 33. [3] Ibid. 30.

Scipios. The populace was content to laugh; the senate trembled. The progress of his madness was also marked by innumerable executions, due to caprice or greed; but these evoked no resistance. It was told that the tyrant caused executions to take place at his table in order to stimulate his appetite; but this was only on a par with the rest.[1] His return from Gaul had therefore been awaited with horror. A deputation was commissioned to invite him home, and at the same time to beg a more gracious disposition; he answered, with his hand on his sword, "I will come—and bring this with me."[2] He kept his word; the number of his murderous behests was only surpassed by the atrocity of their execution.

For the happiness of the world, one of his victims, while under examination, succeeded in arousing his distrust of his immediate *entourage*. His freedmen soon agreed with the prefect of the Prætorians that it was high time for a change. The tribune Chærea volunteered to strike the fatal blow. This man had served with honour under Germanicus, but as he had a high eunuch's voice, Caligula was pleased to make sport of him, giving him watchwords such as Cupido, Priapus, Venus and the like, which stirred the laughter of the other officers. To be secure against the Prætorians, who were not admitted to the secret, it was resolved to cut down the tyrant in the presence of the people assembled in the theatre. The deed was consummated on the 24th January, 41, just as Caligula had left the performance. But no sooner did the news reach the barracks than the Germans seized their swords. They were joined by gladiators and slaves, and hurried to the theatre to wreak vengeance on guilty and innocent alike. On the other hand, the conspirators ruthlessly slew Caligula's wife Cæsonia, with her little girl, upon the corpse of her husband. So the tide of fortune ebbed and flowed, when a company of Prætorians chanced upon Claudius, uncle of the murdered prince, and forthwith proclaimed him emperor.

[1] Suet. Cal. 32. [2] Ibid. 49.

7. Religious Reactions.

The reign of terror in 39 and 40 had kept the Jewish population everywhere in an agony of suspense between hope and fear. No wonder that it left a deep impression on the popular mind. For scores of years afterwards, the Roman government met with profound mistrust. Tacitus tells us plainly of the Jews' fear lest these same impious behests should be renewed.[1] The advocates of the desecration of the temple, although they did not return to public life, were not forgotten. Josephus has more edifying than seemly stories to tell of Apion's end.[2] Even the Christians remembered the name of Apion, the great blasphemer. In the Clementine "Recognitiones," Apion appears as a pander and corrupter of youth, who makes practical applications of Greek theology of an immoral character, and yet can persecute Jews and Christians as atheists. Elsewhere, too, he is mentioned in Christian Apocrypha as a slanderer of the holy people, as the devil and Satan.[3]

But the year was more important for its indirect effects on the religious consciousness. Just as it was characteristic of the Greeks to re-cast their life and sufferings in the form of art and transmute them into beauty, so it suited the genius of the Hebrews to turn all their experiences to the enrichment of their religious conceptions. On the one hand, we can trace the history of the nation in plastic forms; on the other, in forms of dogma. The upheaval of these latter years, while far more striking than that of Maccabean times, was, like them, immediately productive in religion, although it had not been preceded by the same long education in suffering. In the course of the years of struggle, the attempt to set up the unholy in the holy place, successful in many synagogues and essayed at least in the temple, stirred

[1] Ann. 12, 54. [2] Ap. 2, 13.

[3] Cf. the Apocryphum cited in Euseb. 3, 38; and Clem. Recogn. 10, 58, seq., edit. Gersdorf, p. 248, seq.

men to remember that the last days were to be, according to all the prophets, a strife between heathen and God-fearing powers; according to Daniel, the struggle of a heathen prince against Israel. Such was the origin of the belief that the tribulation of the last days would culminate in the defilement of the temple by Antichrist, who would establish himself in the sanctuary and exact the payment of divine honours. This dogmatic cast of the experiences of the last years came home to men all the more because the Book of Daniel, the favourite and most widely read of all the prophetic books,[1] gave an exact picture of the undertakings which Caligula was unable to accomplish. As if referring to the future, the author of the book had thrown into prophetic form the experiences of Jerusalem in the year 168, when Antiochus Epiphanes dedicated the temple of Jehovah to Zeus, and erected a small altar of Zeus upon the altar of burnt-offering.[2] The Jews named this event their detestation, "the abomination that maketh desolate" (shikkuz meshomem),[3] an expression employed by them to designate every circumstance of idolatry, from altars to images.[4] The author of the Book of Daniel, who saw a sign of the approaching judgment-day in the desecration of the temple, made his prophet predict that the latter days would already have begun their course if the abomination that maketh desolate were set in the holy place. "A king shall return and have indignation against the holy covenant; so shall he do, and have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant. And arms shall stand on his part, and they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily sacrifice, and they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate. And such as do wickedly against the covenant shall he corrupt by flatteries." . . . . "And the king shall do according to his will, and he shall exalt himself and magnify himself above

[1] Cf. Vol. i. p. 193 (Eng. trans.).

[2] Maç. i. 29, seq., 37, 45, 54, 59; vi. 7.

[3] Dan. ix. 27; xi. 31.

[4] Lev. xviii. 22—26; Deut. xxxii. 16; xxix. 16; 1 Kings xiv. 24; xi. 5, 7; 2 Kings xxiii. 13; Is. xliv. 19.

every god, and shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods, and shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished."[1] In these words the prophet has drawn a clear and unmistakable portrait of Antiochus Epiphanes. His assurance, therefore, that the latter days should last only three-and-a-half years before the coming of the Son of Man gained all the wider credence. This expectation, that the Messianic salvation was to follow immediately upon the tribulations that came in the wake of Antiochus, was one of the strongest motives of the Maccabean revolt; a revolt which in the end at least secured liberty, if not the kingdom of God.

At the time that the first book of Maccabees was composed, the moment when Hyrcanus had crowned his struggles with victory, the meaning of the "abomination that maketh desolate" in the Book of Daniel was well known.[2] But later, when the tribulation of the Roman period came on, Daniel's iron kingdom was no longer identified with the Greek, but with the Roman epoch; while what had been thrown into prophetic form by Daniel himself was now actually regarded as a future event.[3] Antichrist, it was thought, had still to come, and aid in the destruction of the heathen empire by keeping up its iniquities. Remembrance of the original reference to Antiochus, however, grew fainter and fainter, as time showed it was not, after all, the prelude to the last days. The prophecy seemed to predict a future enemy of Jehovah in the same general way as the book of the prophet Ezekiel. This tells of a struggle on the last day of the world but one, between the Messianic Israel and the prince Gog from the land of Magog. Henceforth the teacher identifies the last age of Israel either with the time of Gog, or with the time when the "abomination of desolation" should be set up in the holy place.[4] The earliest assurance, after Daniel, of an Antichrist, comes in an oracle of the Jewish Sibyl, referred,

[1] Cf. Daniel xi. 21—45.

[2] Cf. 1 Macc. i. 54 and Dan. ix. 27; xi. 31; xii. 11.

[3] Cf. Vol. i. p. 193.

[4] Pseudo-Jonathan on Levit. xxvi. 44; Apoc. xx. 8; Matt. xxiv. 15.

though wrongly, to the time of Cleopatra. In this, "Beliar" is represented as coming from Sebaste and perverting mankind with mighty wonders and delusions.[1]

Yet though the figure of the great adversary of the holy people and of their Messiah had been completely lost to remembrance, it could not fail to revive in the experiences of these last years. What better text could the learned in the Scriptures take for their discourses in the temple than that of the "vile person," "to whom they shall not give the honour of the kingdom, but he shall obtain it by flatteries;"[2] who does "that which his fathers have not done, nor his fathers' fathers;"[3] who "has indignation against the holy covenant, and has intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant"?[4] They saw before them "arms stand on his part," and "a raiser of taxes in the glory of the kingdom;" now, too, they heard the king "speak marvellous things against the God of gods," the king "who regarded not the God of his fathers."[5] Verily the shikkuz is in readiness, wrought by the devices of the heathen; yet a time, and the trial comes in which "such as do wickedly against the covenant shall be corrupt by flatteries; but the people that do know their God shall be strong, and do exploits."[6] Such was the approximation between past and present, between promise and reality, that a connection between them became inevitable. Yet once more fulfilment failed at the moment realization seemed at hand. Caligula fell without accomplishing his purpose. But prophecy had prepared men's minds too well. The Rabbis had been only too successful in proving that, according to Daniel, the temple must suffer the abomination of desolation before the coming of the Messiah. The utterances of dogma survived the turn of events. From this time rather, the first place in the expectation of the end is more and more occupied

[1] Sib. iii. 64—92, placed by Friedlieb in the time of the second triumvirate, though the writer openly copies 2 Thess. ii. and the Apocalypse.

[2] Dan. xi. 21. [3] v. 24. [4] v. 30.

[5] Dan. xi. 20, 36, 37. [6] Dan. xi. 31, 32.

by the monstrous figure of Anti-Messias, Antichrist, the prince of ungodliness, who exerts diabolical powers to bar the realization of the Messiah's glory.[1]

The paraphrases of the Targums give an excellent illustration of the way in which Antichrist was the dominant idea. A whole series of passages are referred to him, though they do not admit of any such special signification. Thus Isaiah, xi. 4, says of the Messiah, "He shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked." The Targum Jonathan, however, translates, "with the breath of his lips shall he slay the miscreant Armillus." Now this name Armillus, often borne by the Antichrist, is usually derived from a surname of Caius, who, as well as being called Caligula, from his boots, was called Armillatus, from his bracelets.[2] Again, in Numbers xi. 26, the Targum Jerushalemi takes the opportunity of making Moses deliver a prophecy against the great adversary of the Messsah. "Behold, a king goeth forth from the land of Gog and Magog in the latter days. He shall gather together his tributary kings with crowns upon their heads, and his princes in harness of mail. Every nation obeys him. He will draw up his warriors in battle-array against the children of the captivity in the land of Israel. But long since was the hour of his destruction appointed." Once more, the Targum on Deut. xxxiv. 2, is able to tell us how on Mount Nebo the word of the Lord announced to Moses the plagues of each epoch, the vengeance that should one day befall "Armalgus the ungodly," the war with Gog, and Michael's saving aid for Israel. Then, too, when Moses spoke with God on Mount Nebo, the Eternal showed him, in the legend of the Rabbis, the roads and ravines by which Gog was to approach Jerusalem in order to lay waste the eternal city. The teachers, too, repeatedly refer the words of the second

[1] 2 Thess. ii. 2.

[2] Suet. Calig. 52, says in particular of Caligula, "Armillatus in publicum processit," which Hitzig, Daniel, p. 125; Hist. of Isr. 583, uses to explain the difficult name Armillatus.

Psalm, "Why do the heathen rage and the rulers take counsel together against the Lord and against his anointed?" to the Antichrist's war against the Messiah.[1] Later, indeed, the Rabbis were even able to name the spot to which Caligula's bronze statue had been brought when news came of his death, while a special feast commemorated the unfinished desecration of the temple.[2]

The Revelation of John showed to what extent all these reminiscences pervaded ordinary life, and how firmly the whole ideal was established in the next two decades. In it we find the same conception of Antichrist's march on the holy city for the final and decisive battle.[3] The Christian community in particular incorporated special features from these years into their expectations of the end of the world; for, their belief being essentially expectation of the immediate return of the Messiah, it may be imagined with what breathless expectancy they watched if the "abomination that maketh desolate" were actually to be set up in the holy place. Were it so, the clear prediction of the Book of Daniel left no long time to wait before the day of the Son of Man. Thus the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians[4] contains precisely this explanation of Christ's delay in returning, namely, that the desecration of the temple, threatened by Caligula and anxiously awaited by every Jew in the years 39 and 40, had not yet been accomplished. "The day of Christ," we read, "shall not come, except there come a falling away first and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; *so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.* Remember ye not that when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth

[1] Mechilta on Exod. xvii. 14; Berachot Bab. p. 7,b.
[2] Derenbourg, Palest. après les thalmuds, p. 208, note.
[3] Rev. xx. 7.
[4] 2 Thess. ii. 3—11.

will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." Whether these words are Paul's own or merely pass under his name, no one can fail to recognize how the writer's consciousness is coloured by personal or historical reminiscences of Caligula's time, the return of which was so much dreaded by the Jews.

This expectation on the part of the Jews must also have been generally known and ridiculed throughout the empire; for though the Romans had no better comprehension for the motives of Jewish policy than the Frenchman of to-day for the thoughts of an Algerian true-believer, or the Briton for the meditations of a Hindu, still Tacitus is in general well informed upon the position of affairs. "Although Caligula's mandate," we read in the Histories,[1] "was not accomplished, still there remained the fear that some other prince might issue a like behest." It is no wonder, then, that after the outbreak of the Jewish war in 68, the writer of the Apocalypse represents Nero as the false god who meets with actual worship, the Beast followed by the whole world. "And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies: and power was given unto him to continue forty and two months. And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven. And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them; and power was given him over all kindreds and tongues and nations. And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world."[2] But this general reference to the prince of the world, with his divine pretensions, is not sufficient. A further characteristic from the actual time is worked in—the appearance of a false prophet who demands divine worship for the emperor's statue. "He says to them that

[1] Tac. Hist. 12, 54. [2] Rev. xiii. 5—8.

dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast," that they should be marked with his name like slaves. The image and name of the beast, indeed, are stamped on every coin, so that none can buy or sell without becoming unclean.[1] About the same time, the desecration of the temple is predicted in Matthew's eschatology as a presage of the last judgment. But to one who had looked upon the desolate hills around Jerusalem, the abomination that lays desolate becomes the abomination of desolation; the shikkuz is no longer a statue of Antichrist, such as Petronius had had cast, but a heathen standard planted upon the holy hill. "When therefore," he cries, "ye shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place (whoso readeth, let him understand), then let them which be in Judæa flee into the mountains."[2] Finally, Josephus, who not only saw the siege, like the Christian eschatologists and the author of the Apocalypse, but also the destruction of the temple, is once more intermediate between the consciousness of his own nation and Rome. He does not find the abomination of desolation in the sacrifice to the genius of Vespasian, nor in the images that rose above the standards, but, like a true Pharisee, in the fact that the Zealots had made a square out of the space between the temple and Antonia—in other words, had stamped the sign of the world upon the spot which ought to bear the sign of God.[3]

Christ, then, was to be preceded by Antichrist, and the appearance of the new Jerusalem by the desecration of the old. Such was the conviction which had come to every school of Hebrews, Zealots, Pharisees and Christians, from the experiences of the days of Caligula, a conviction from which proceeded the richest development of Jewish religious conceptions in these years.

Far different were the impressions of the Hellenistic Jews. To them, the desecration and re-consecration of their synagogues had become an every-day occurrence in the vicissitudes of the three

[1] Rev. xiii. 14, 17. [2] Matt. xxiv. 15, 16.
[3] Bell vi. 5, 4. See Vol. i. p. 118 (Eng. trans.).

years' struggle at Alexandria. They, too, for the most part, did not hold so strongly to the belief in the immediate coming of the kingdom. Hardly anything could bring out more clearly the characteristic difference between Hebraist and Hellenist theology, than the different way in which Jerusalem and Alexandria regarded identical experiences. To the Hebrew consciousness, Caligula is distorted into the type of Antichrist; to the Alexandrians, he appears as the typical example of the folly of all heathendom. The Hebrews, with secret horror, suspect demoniac powers in him; he is the object of their supreme contempt, such as they invariably show, indeed, to polytheism in every form. He adds one more gloomy conception to their expectation of the world's immediate dissolution, while the Hellenists make use of him for the purposes of their enlightenment, to show that the rest of the Hellenic gods are on the same footing as the divinity of Caligula.

The earliest quotation from the Book of Wisdom is found in Paul's Epistle to the Romans, two decades later than these events, a fact inevitably suggesting the recent origin of the book. Written in Alexandria, the section beginning with chapter vi. seems directly prompted by the struggle over the divinity of the emperor, although anterior in date to the critical moment of the struggle, the desecration of the synagogues and the temple. It appears, indeed, from the first half of the book, as if the author had primarily intended to develope the doctrine of the divine Wisdom or Logos; but in proving the historical efficacy of this divine æon, he comes to the depravity of the Egyptians, a subject which he was afterward unable to quit.[1] From chapter vi. onwards, he is engrossed in the struggle between Alexandrians and Jews; all that follows has reference to this question as appears from his threat that the ten plagues of Egypt, ordained by Moses, should return; from the stirring of his hatred against the unstable Alexandrians, "who take existence

[1] Apart from this distinct date of its composition, Ewald, Hist. Isr. iv. 551, has pointed out this transition from vi. 22, onwards.

for a jest and life for a profitable fair;"[1] and from his scorn for the Egyptians, who have idols, indeed, yet not even beautiful—monstrous figures in which no eye can take pleasure—and who have reached the lowest degradation of worshipping animals.[2]

The concluding object of his polemic is the apotheosis of the Cæsars. The spirited and erudite author is well acquainted with those insane speculations whereby Caligula proved to his own satisfaction that the Julian race was made of different clay from all other mortals, and that the sovereign of mankind sprang from a higher species of man than the humanity that lay in the dust at his feet.[3] This is why Solomon, a king, but a wise king, is made to acknowledge:[4] "I myself also am a mortal man, like to all, and the offspring of him that was first made of the earth, and in my mother's womb was fashioned to be flesh in the time of ten months, being compacted in blood. . . . And when I was born, I drew in the common air and fell upon the earth, which is of like nature, and the first voice which I uttered was crying, as all others do. I was nursed in swaddling-clothes, and that with cares. For there is no king that had any other beginning of birth; for all men have one entrance into life, and the like going out. *Wherefore I prayed, and understanding was given me; I called upon God, and the spirit of wisdom came to me.*

By the aid of wisdom only, the next chapter continues, do kings attain honour. Without accounting himself divine, Solomon could go so far as to say of himself: "When I hold my tongue, they shall bide my leisure; and when I speak, they shall give good ear unto me; if I talk much, they shall lay their hands on their mouth." The very apotheosis of the Cæsars had betrayed the secret of idolatry to the thinker. Idols probably came into existence everywhere in the same way as the present images of Caligula. "Whom men could not honour in presence, because they dwelt far off, they took the counterfeit of his visage

[1] Wisdom xv. 13.
[2] Wisdom xv. 14—19; xi. 15.
[3] Leg. ad Cai. Mang. 553.
[4] Wisdom vii. 1—7.

from far, and made an express image of a king whom they honoured, to the end that by this their forwardness they might flatter him that was absent as if he were present. Also the singular diligence of the artificer did help to set forward the ignorant to more superstition. For he peradventure, willing to please one in authority, forced all his skill to make the resemblance of the best fashion. And so the multitude, allured by the grace of the work, took him now for a god, which a little before was but honoured for a man. And this was an occasion to deceive the world; for men, serving either calamity or tyranny, did ascribe unto stones and stocks the incommunicable name."[1]

As for the Egyptians, now and of old the most ardent in this worship of men—nay, lower still, of animals—they were "a cursed seed from the beginning."[2] The worshippers of beasts, by beasts they shall be punished; for man shall be chastened by that in which he has sinned.[3] Once before, the Egyptians clamoured for the banishment of the Jews; yet, when the Jews were ready to depart, would not let them go. This city, worse than Sodom, which would not receive the stranger, would make bondsmen of the strangers who deserve well of her. Once they received the nation with promise of equal rights; now that Israel is in their power, he is enslaved. This wicked and perverse generation has thus practised all wickedness against Israel from the beginning; it may well reflect how the Lord avenged his son Israel on that occasion. It is not undesignedly that there follows a minute description of all the plagues with which the ancient Egyptians were visited. Among these, the Egyptian darkness gives the author an opportunity of peopling the valley of the Nile with all the spectres of his imagination.

The slime of Nile is still fertile as of yore; it can still engender flies and frogs and lice. Herein the rabble of Alexandria may find food for thought. And still the Word reigns in heaven—that mighty angel of God, who in those days descended

[1] Wisdom xiv. 15—21. [2] Wisdom xii. 11, 24. [3] Wisdom xvi. 1.

upon Egypt. "For while all things were in quiet silence, and that night was in the midst of her swift course, thine Almighty Word [the Logos] leaped down from heaven out of thy royal throne, as a fierce man of war into the midst of a land of destruction, and brought thine unfeigned commandment, and standing up filled all things with death; and it touched the heaven, but it stood upon the earth."[1] The Jews in Egypt may therefore calmly withstand the rage and clamour of the Alexandrian mob. When the Egyptians oppressed their ancestors in the days of old, the Lord opened them "out of the Red Sea a way without impediment, and out of the violent stream a green field," and they went their way unmolested. "They went at large like horses, and leaped like lambs." The writer may well believe that the Lord will do no less in these days; that he can make an island of refuge rise up beside the Pharos; "for," he concludes confidently, "the Lord has never yet forgotten Israel, but helps him at every time and in every place." Profound souls these, and pious, in the bosom of this Alexandrian synagogue, whence we catch such utterance! Indeed, it may safely be asserted that in the succeeding centuries no historian of the Roman world had such influence over men's minds, so wide a circle of readers and auditors, as this Jew, who here screens his identity behind the purple cloak of the royal sage.

Thus the Book of Wisdom directs its argument and exhortation to the heathen princes as well as "the judges upon earth," from beginning to end, one and all, and the famous ones "who have delight in thrones and sceptres." Meanwhile we possess another book of this eventful period, the so-called Third Book of Maccabees. The readers this book has in view are its own co-religionists, more especially those who through persecution and neglect were ready to submit to the lord of this world, and bring the desired sacrifices at the expense of their creed. These were neither few nor inconspicuous; the alabarch's own son, Tiberius Alexander, had turned renegade, and thus of course

[1] Wisdom xviii. 14—16.

paved his way to the highest honour of the kingdom. These are the men to whose conscience the Third Book of Maccabees would speak, while keeping proportionately calm towards the Gentiles, and expressly distinguishing the "well-disposed Greeks" from the rabble and courtiers.[1] A favourite thought, therefore, with this book is the assurance that the Jews of Alexandria had always surpassed every other nationality in loyalty to the authorities, so that all rulers had at last been taught to rely on the Jews, not their opponents.

This moral is attached to a piece of Alexandrian history which was always a source of pride to the Jews. In the second century B.C., Cleopatra, the widow of Philometor, had entrusted her army to the Jews Onias and Dositheus, who conducted the war on her behalf against her brother-in-law Physcon in 145. They were unable, however, to prevent Physcon from making himself master of Alexandria, where, amid the acclamations of the Alexandrian rabble, he had Jews and Jewesses flung naked before the elephants. But the creatures, disconcerted by the strange sight, drew back and trampled down their drivers as well as the crowds who had gathered to gloat over the spectacle.[2] The Alexandrian Jews celebrated the memory of this day in a yearly festival. The feast of Elephants had much the same significance to them as the feast of Purim to the Hebrews, and was at the same time a commemoration of Jewish loyalty. However, the writer of 3 Maccabees confuses the gist of this fable with various legends of Ptolemy Philopator, who had obtained possession of the Holy Land in 217 by the victory of Naphia, and seems to have commended himself but little to the priesthood during his stay in Judæa.

Now in the book before us, Caligula is masked behind the figure of Ptolemy Philopator. The prince, whom the writer has in mind, owed a debt of gratitude to the Jews from the outset. This is immediately clear from the introduction; for a Jewish apostate, Dositheus, son of Drimylus, had saved his life from a

[1] 3 Mac. i. 27; iii. 5, 8, seq.; v. 41. [2] Jos. Contr. Apion, ii. 5.

plot with Jewish wit and devotion, by placing a substitute in his tent. But the tyrant took it ill that, though he had gone over all other temples in the world, the priests at Jerusalem refused him leave to see theirs. Though all the people of Palestine gathered together—though little children left their nurseries, modest women their homes, men their fields and ploughs, to supplicate against his desecration of the temple—though the priests could hardly restrain the once loyal nation from insurrection—he persisted in his design, only—who reads, may mark and learn—to be seized on the threshold by an invisible hand, blown back like spray, and carried off by his retainers with tongue and limbs paralyzed.

Once recovered from his fears and back in Alexandria, the tyrant deadened his conscience with wild excesses, and now resolved to punish the Jews for being the only nation to refuse him admission to their temple. In the first place, he forbade all visits to Jewish sanctuaries, probably to put an end to proselytism.[1] Next, he took away the privileges of the Jews, and commanded that each man should be branded with an ivy-leaf[2] as a sign of Dionysus, since it was a current saying in Alexandria, and known to Tacitus, that their cult was a degenerate worship of Bacchus. Then a great part is played by the enumeration and registering of the Jewish inhabitants, for this was to be the means of degrading them to an inferior class. This feature is perhaps connected with the circumstances of the writer, and possibly refers to certain affairs passed over by Philo. The full privileges of the Alexandrians are only to be enjoyed by those who are converted to their gods and submit to initiation into their mysteries. At last the despot, going from wrath to wrath, issues an order to bring all the Jews in his empire to Alexandria, there to have the elephants let loose upon them in the circus. But it happens once more as in Caligula's persecutions. No sooner are the Jews prepared for the worst, than the emperor, whose sanity seems doubtful, turns his wrath

[1] 3 Macc. ii. 27, 28. [2] Ib. ii. 27—30; Tac. Hist. 5, 5.

upon his own courtiers. When the day of the great fight with the wild beasts is fixed, the emperor oversleeps himself; another time he has completely forgotten his commands, and is indignant with his suite for refreshing his memory. So the Jews remain in suspense, the characteristic of the years 39 and 40. However, the outrage is at last perpetrated; but the elephants are dazzled by angels, and, turning upon their drivers, trample them underfoot. Thereupon a transformation passes over Ptolemy-Caligula; he behaves as though it were another who had issued this command, storming and raving against his cruel court that would torment his most faithful subjects. To complete the change, the Jews are feasted for fourteen days, and an annual festival is to be kept in honour of those who, though tormented to death, did not forget their loyalty. Finally, the emperor liberates all the prisoners of the Dispersal, pledging himself to maintain all their privileges in their native land.

With a man so incalculable as Caligula, it was quite within the bounds of possibility that his designs should ultimately come to such a conclusion; indeed, this seems to be precisely the point in which the writer seeks consolation for himself and his friends. Too loyal to suggest that severe punishment awaits the emperor, too prudent to hint at violent means of deliverance, he puts down everything to the changeability of the despot, at the same time suggesting to his ministers that excessive zeal is hardly advisable in carrying out orders which the prince may repent of by the next day. This so-called Philopator, then, is personally far less responsible than his surroundings. The faithful Jews are perfectly ready to come to an excellent understanding with him; they have always lived in peace with all good Hellenes, and even at the time of most grievous oppression have never thought of revolution or assassination of the Cæsar. Inflexible severity must be shown only to those renegades who renounced the law. Henceforth no meal may be taken with them, no marriage contracted, no business concluded.[1] The writer would

[1] 3 Macc. ii. 23, seq.

like to see Caligula act as he makes his Philopator act, empowering the Jewish community to massacre all the renegades, three hundred in number, on the ground that, as they had not begun by remaining true to their own law, they would be still less likely to remain loyal to the emperor in the hour of danger.[1]

We have here, then, under a transparent veil, a broad description of the struggles in Alexandria, which clearly gives a more correct picture of the opinions, the hopes and fears, of the Jews in that city than the highly-coloured pathos of Philo or Josephus, who hold very heroic language after the death of the tyrant. On this last point the book that goes furthest is the Fourth Book of Maccabees, which has a similar background in the renewal of the Maccabean struggle over the laws about meats, and the executions of Jews in the public squares of Alexandria. But the easy latitude of its language points to quiet times in which there was leisure for self-congratulation over the past. We hear the recollection of dangers surmounted in the writer's apostrophe to Eleazar: "Thou a priest, worthy of the priesthood, hast not defiled thy righteous teeth with eating of the unclean, nor thy body that was filled with godly meat."[2] In his eyes, however, the victory of the Jews over Gentile persecution is very different from the mystical conception to be found in the Hebrew Scriptures. It is a victory of reason over pain and desire. His Stoical declamations can only be called a memorial of Caligula's period, so far as they point to that renewed zeal for the law which filled even the Hellenists after the days of persecution. For however much the writer shows himself a friend to enlightenment, a believer in reason, an aspirant to oratorical fame, still his feeling culminates in these words: "I will not deny thee, thou law that dost edify with wisdom; I will not abjure thee, beloved sobriety, nor dishonour thee, O understanding that dost thirst after wisdom; I will not reject thee, most honourable priesthood, nor thee, lofty knowledge of the law."[3]

[1] 2 Macc. vii. 8—14. [2] 4 Macc. vii. [3] 4 Macc. v.

Thus an inward regeneration began with the victory of the Jews over the insanity of Cæsar-worship. The extremity of the situation had everywhere aided the victory of extreme tendencies; reactionary influences obtained a distinct power. If the laws about meats could rouse the spirit of martyrdom in the Hellenists of Alexandria, no wonder that, wherever possible, the Hebrews laid greater stress on the legal view. The people in general now attached itself to the Pharisees; even in Christian circles nothing is heard of disputes with the Jews about the law, but proportionately more of their struggles to make the heathen converts submit to circumcision.

---

6. The Restoration of the Theocracy.

On the day of Caligula's assassination, the 24th of January, 41, Herod Agrippa had been in the emperor's train and yet had escaped the daggers of the conspirators, who certainly would not have shown him the least mercy. He had eluded the Germans after the theatre, and on hearing how Claudius, Germanicus' brother, had been acclaimed Cæsar by the Prætorians, he hastened to his side, in order to lend courage to his timidity. Then he hurried to the senate in festal garments, as if he had just risen from table, and offered to negociate with Claudius, who could no doubt be prevailed upon to renounce the sovereignty. While the senate imagined they were dealing with a regular agent, he was in fact nothing but Claudius' spy, who informed him of the senate's embarrassment, and delayed action on their part until the whole garrison of Rome had declared for the new emperor. Thus gladiators and galley-slaves, in conjunction with the Celtic legion, the Germans and the Jew Agrippa, gave the empire a new sovereign in one whose stupidity had become proverbial in Roman society. His very mother, Antonia, would describe an incapable as "stupider than my son Claudius." It was to no

purpose that the senate resisted; that Chaerea showed the cohorts the folly of replacing a madman by an idiot. Claudius was proclaimed; the senate only escaped sharing the fate of the conspirators through the intercession of Herod.

Thus Rome obtained an emperor who till that moment had been the butt of the table at Capreæ, and the embarrassment of his family on public occasions—a man whom Nature, according to another saying of his mother's, more witty than kind, had only sketched, not finished.[1]

This change of emperors inaugurates a new era in the palace. Augustus, Tiberius and Caligula, had actually governed. But Claudius was incapable of governing. At the same time, conditions were entirely unfavourable to senatorial government. Hence a new administration arises, the reign of freedmen, as it was called by the indignant aristocracy. Certain cultivated Greek servants, belonging to the class of *liberti*, advised and supported Claudius in his weighty position of prince and in the literary occupations of his leisure. Considering the slight confidence reposed by the emperor either in himself or in the Roman nobility, it was perfectly natural that these former friends and counsellors should now take their place as a cabinet between the emperor and his official representatives. They conveyed the wishes of the officials to the emperor; the officials received the imperial commands through their mouth.

Supreme amongst them was Narcissus, an administrator of iron industry, of harsh character, and, it was said, a eunuch.[2] His sole passion was avarice; before long he amassed a princely fortune. Public affairs were practically in his hands; he dictated political decisions to the emperor, whose side he never left.

Next to him came Pallas. Originally one of Antonia's slaves, he had grown up with Claudius and had successfully adapted himself to the forms of the great world. His department was finance, in administering which he did not forget himself. In

[1] Suet. Claud. 3.

[2] According to a Scholium on Juvenal.

fourteen years he laid by sixty millions. But his ambition was not satisfied with wealth and power; he prized the show as much as the substance. Although no freedman might legally hold curule office, he received the insignia of the prætorship; for the senate remembered that Virgil sang of the Arcadian kings Evander and Pallas, and suspected the blood-royal of Arcadia in the modern Pallas. Agrippina, the sister of Caligula, now recalled from exile, became his mistress. His brother Felix allied himself to the imperial house by marrying a granddaughter of Claudius' grandfather Antonius and of Cleopatra.

A more honourable and deserving man was POLYBIUS, who directed his erudition to the arrangement of the learned compilations with which Claudius sought to prove his intellectual ability. With his assistance, Claudius at length, in part began, in part completed, a work on the Social War, the administration of Augustus and his own autobiography. The emperor's eight books on Carthage and twenty of Tyrrhenica are also chiefly due to Polybius. It was to him that Seneca dedicated his *Consolatio ad Polybium*. He had an amour with the empress Messalina; but on his demanding sole possession of his insatiable mistress, she made away with him—a fate he shared with the other Cæsarian, the handsome Myron.

Finally, the war department was entrusted to the eunuch Posides, Claudius' companion in the British campaign, who at its successful conclusion was invested with the *hasta pura*, the highest honour of ancient Rome.

Government by such hands appeared the last indignity in the eyes of the aristocracy. But the actual administration was not bad. Claudius was hailed as the father of the provinces; he opened the senate to the Gauls; his foreign policy was peaceful without weakness.[1] The harbour of Ostia, the *Aqua Claudia*, and the partial draining of Lake Fucinus, were works which extorted the praise of his enemies as the greatest undertakings

[1] Suet. Claud. 17, 25; Tac. Ann. xi. 10, 20; Agricola.

of their own age.[1] But the good impression of these public services was utterly destroyed by the state of his domestic circle. A voluptuary at the age of fifty, he had Messalina for his fifth wife; her successor was to be Agrippina, the dishonoured sister of Caligula. Messalina herself was a slave to the wildest sensuality; not all the prudence of her friends was sufficient to conceal the scandals into which she was continually hurried by her unbridled character. Even the fact that she was the mother of Britannicus, the emperor's heir, could not long hide her condition, especially as her rival Agrippina had a powerful ally in her paramour Pallas; while her own extravagances had at last cost her the support of Narcissus.

Such being the state of things at court, the fortunes of the provinces were at the mercy of every intriguer in the palace. Judæa, however, was already beyond the range of caprice; for in those earliest days, before Pallas was able to establish his influence, Herod Agrippa was master of the situation, and used his position with Claudius to secure his portion at once, and to settle those Jewish affairs which had been neglected by his predecessors, agreeably to Jewish feeling. In fact, Caligula's follies had made the former regulations impossible. The procuratorship of Judæa had to go; for all sense of security was impossible while the people saw their temple in the hands of the Gentiles. But the new order of things established by Agrippa went far beyond this necessary minimum. The Jews were placed in such a position throughout the empire, that it was obviously impossible for the Roman people permanently to maintain all the privileges obtained by Agrippa from the boundless gratitude of the new emperor.

A special edict from Claudius proclaimed to the world the privileges won by Herod Agrippa in the Roman empire, and bade the senate set up a bronze tablet on the Capitol recording the grants made to the king.[2] The purport of the grants was as

[1] Suet. 20; Plin. Hist. Nat. 36, 24.

[2] Bell. ii. 11, 5; Ant. xix. 5, 1.

follows: The procuratorship of Judæa and Samaria ceases, and the whole kingdom of the elder Herod is restored. Likewise the portions of Lysanias' dominions with which Caligula had invested the Arab Soem,[1] viz. Abilene (between Hermon and Damascus), are united to the kingdom of Agrippa. In the north of the kingdom, too, the province of Syria had to cede the principality of Chalcis to Herod, king Agrippa's eldest brother.

In this way a territory such as no Jewish king had ever possessed, not even David nor the first Herod, was brought under the Jewish sceptre. Herod found it convenient, also, to designate the ancient realm of his grandfather as his *hereditary dominions,* and, to the astonishment of Roman politicians, contrived to have a treaty struck with him in the forum as if with an independent sovereign, according to the ancient formulæ of the Fetiales, except that the sacrifice of a swine demanded by the ancient ritual was dispensed with in his case. Further, Agrippa received consular rank in the official hierarchy of Rome, so that he was able to appear in the senate with his brother, the prince of Chalcis, who had been granted the insignia of prætor, and return thanks in the Greek language.[2] As a piece of senatorial administration, these proceedings met with universal approval.[3]

So far, however, Rome had only heard Agrippa's personal demands. The settlement of the Alexandrian claims was a separate matter. In Alexandria, the news of Caligula's death had re-animated the fallen courage of the Jews. They had rushed to arms, purified the synagogues, and occupied fortified positions.[4] None the less Claudius had to take their side unconditionally. Alabarch Alexander was set free without delay, and was honoured with Claudius' special favour as the old steward of his mother Antonia. A rescript from the new Cæsar placed affairs in Alexandria on the same footing as before the

[1] Dio, 59, 12.

[2] Suet. Claud. 25; Ant. xix. 5, 1. For the inscriptions referring to these events, see Schürer, Hist. of New Test. Times, 293.

[3] Dio, 60, 8.

[4] Ant. xix. 5, 2.

accession of Caligula—restoring the dignity of the alabarch, and enjoining on the consul the unconditional duty of protecting Jewish worship.

Not content with this, Agrippa succeeded in getting an imperial rescript sent to all the provinces, extending the same privileges to the Jews everywhere; that is to say, they were granted freedom of worship and trial in their own courts, according to the edicts of the divine Augustus.

After such brilliant successes, even Agrippa could ask no more. He hastened to Jerusalem, to take in hand the organization of his newly-made kingdom, under the title of the Great King. He was preceded by the fame of having re-united Israel, saved the Alexandrians, and released the whole Dispersal from their oppressors. So there was now far greater justification for the cry of "Marin! Marin!" than on his progress from the sea-port to Jerusalem in the spring of 41. Despicable as his past had been, there is no doubt that he became a king after the heart of the dominant party. It might be supposed that Caligula's boon companion would be a bad sovereign for a people whose very looks betrayed a smouldering hatred of the Gentiles. Yet here, too, Agrippa was not deserted by the suppleness which had brought him safely over the blood-stained soil of Capreæ, thick set with traps and pitfalls. In spite of all levity in religion, he was perfectly clear that his only course was to walk in the garb of the strictest Pharisaic legality. So he did not fail to pose before the people as the descendant of David's royal line, who had come to restore the fallen house of David.

His first concern was to offer praise and thanksgiving in the place where his fathers had sacrificed. The temple was overjoyed to open its gates to him after standing for thirty years in submission to the heathen. The king's sacrifices of thanksgiving were offered, as the Pharisees gladly noted, "so that no legal usage was neglected."[1] The new sovereign helped many poor persons to fulfil their vows, charging his treasury with the cost

[1] Ant. xix. 6, 1.

of all burnt-offerings, sin-offerings and thank-offerings owed by the Nazirites. He hung up in the temple both the iron chain with which he had been fettered by Tiberius and the chain of gold presented to him by Caligula, as memorable gifts; and, by way of celebrating his accession, declared that he would give up the house-tax in the Holy City, as being Jehovah's property.

It was especially his purpose to rest his government on the Pharisees, for it was they who possessed the affections of the people. He fixed his residence in the neighbourhood of the Holy City, and was always present at the feast like any ordinary man, to eat the Paschal lamb and taste the bitter herbs. He set the phylactery on his forehead, and widened the hem of his garment. Most important of all, he was always to be seen surrounded by the first Rabbis of the country, to whose opinion he paid the greatest deference.[1]

At the head of the famous Rabbis to whom he attached himself, stands Gamaliel, celebrated for his gentle character, and the most famous champion of the school of Hillel. In concert with him, as president of the Sanhedrin, all existing difficulties between the secular and spiritual powers were soon smoothed over. Gamaliel is credited with those precepts of the Jerusalem Talmud that inculcate tolerance on the Jews, as well as the ordinances not to exclude the Gentiles from gleaning in the corn-fields, nor to refuse them the salutation of peace even on their way to hold festival at their places of abomination, nor to prevent them in mixed communities from entrusting their sufferers to the care of those who ministered to the sick and needy—precepts one and all showing that the new government was bent upon moderating the more violent antagonisms by persuasion on either side.[2]

The greater concessions, however, were naturally made to the Jews, or rather directly to the Pharisees. This is the light in which one cannot but view Agrippa's preliminary step of de-

[1] Ant. xix. 3, 7.

[2] Cf. Grätz, Gesch. der Juden, 3, 276; Derenbourg, 15, p. 239.

stroying the supremacy of the Sadducees, as displayed in the family of Annas. The king deposed Annas' son Theophilus from the dignity of high-priest, and named Simon Cantheras in his place, thus recalling the Herodian family of the Boëthusi, which had heen incorporated in the priestly aristocracy. Negociations, however, were afterwards opened with the family of Annas, when Agrippa wished to re-appoint the former high-priest Jonathan. But Jonathan refused, saying that the Law did not allow the sacred office to be held twice. The king therefore chose his brother, Matthias, son of Annas. But the reconciliation was only temporary; it was not long before Agrippa found himself compelled to apply once more to a son of Cantheras, and replace the Sadducees by the more pliant Boëthusi. Agrippa, too, is said to have restored the practice of introducing into the Sanhedrin not only priests, but also eminent scribes, the first of whom is said to have been Gamaliel.[1]

At all events, the concessions which Agrippa made to Pharisaism in his domestic circle appear most extraordinary. It may be, as Rabbinical sources affirm, that his wife Cypros was sincerely attached to the Pharisees.[2] In his own case, however, it was only as a matter of policy that he required the aspirants to the hand of his daughters to submit to circumcision,[3] and was himself most precise in his observance of the Law. But the results of carrying out this policy were slight, although they might be inconvenient enough to himself. In former days his coins had borne the head of Caligula, and for a while that of the founder of his family also; but now he began to strike coins without portraits, so that no one need be compelled to defile himself with the image of the Roman beast.[4] Indeed, the presence of members of the Sanhedrin at his table shows that in Jerusalem at least he held to the Pharisees' cuisine with its

1 Derenbourg, Palest. aprés les thalm. 213; problematically.

2 Derenbourg, p. 210.

3 Ant. xix. 7, 3; xx. 7, 1.

4 Eckhel, 491, 492, 430; Keim, l. c. 52. On the other hand, Schürer, Hist. of New Test. Times, 297, would rather refer these unstamped coins to Agrippa II.

tithes of mint and cummin, so that he could secure men of the synagogue to bear witness that he outshone all other Pharisees in regard for the law.[1] The Talmud further shows us Agrippa in conversation with good queen Cypros. He cannot come to an agreement with her whether the kid or the lamb is the more excellent offering.[2]

Possibly, now that he had achieved great success, the king felt a desire, after his fifty years of riot and luxury, to spend the evening of his life in making his people happy. This was the object Agrippa set before himself; but to believe in the sincerity of the fanaticism he professed would be to give more than his due to our hero, brought up as he had been in the capital, and guilty of breaking far more than the Jewish ordinances about meats at the feasts of Capreæ. He simply took his cue from his surroundings, a lesson learnt in the society of Tiberius and Caligula. For natures like his, Capreæ exists everywhere. His new tyrant was the mad fanaticism of his people. Thus, whenever he stays in Jerusalem, we see Caligula's boon companion standing in the temple morning and evening to wait for the daily sacrifice. There is even a story, derived from the Talmud, that, basket in hand, he mingled with the crowd at the harvest festival, as it brought the first-fruits of field and tree into the temple amid festal songs.[3] Nor is this impossible; Juvenal, referring to the Herods, sneers at the "barefooted kings" who in this guise once attended the feast of their people in Jerusalem.[4]

In the same way, Agrippa followed the Rabbis in restoring the ancient custom whereby the king had to read out the whole of Deuteronomy at the beginning of the sabbatical year. In the year 42, he recited the long passage until he came to the verse in the seventeenth chapter: "One from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee; thou mayst not set a stranger over thee which is not thy brother"—then he dropped the

1 Ant. xix. 7, 3.
2 Derenbourg, 210, 211.
3 Mishna Bikkurim, iii. 4; Grätz, 3, 273.
4 Sat. 14, 97.

book; his voice fell; a flood of tears gushed forth; but the Pharisees cried tumultuously, "Thou art our brother! thou art our brother!"[1] With the same art his master Tiberius had repeatedly disclosed to the senate his purpose of resigning the cares of empire; but woe to the senator who did not conjure him with tears not to leave the state to perish.

Now the life he led at his favourite Cæsarea on the lake proves all his devotion to the law in Jerusalem to have been an odious comedy. There, in Gentile country, he might be the old Agrippa again. It can at least be set down to his credit that he shared the good-nature of many parvenus, and repaid former benefactors for their loyalty. The slave Thaumastus, who brought cold water to refresh him in the court-yard of the castle at Tusculum, was promoted to be his major-domo, and left as a heritage to his children Agrippa and Bernice, in whose service we meet with him again. Another comrade of his adventurous passages, Silas, had been entrusted with the command of his troops; but the old campaigner had to pay with imprisonment for making too free with stories about the king's past life. His place was taken by an experienced captain of cavalry from the Chaldæan colony of Bathyra,[2] one of the old captains of the Trachonitians, whose desertion of Antipas had been of such moment in the Gamalitic war.

While the immediate surroundings of the king were peculiarly profane in tone, his daughter had been notorious in Rome for modelling her conduct upon the Julias, Agrippinas and Messalinas of the court. Even during her father's lifetime her reputation was such that statues of her were placed before houses of ill-fame. Further, the king's Pharisaism did not prevent him from having his son brought up at the court of Messalina, where he learnt what was to be learnt there. Moreover, the king had by no means forgotten his heathen pastimes. At the bottom of his heart he still found the two-edged "Drusian swords" he had

[1] Mishna Sota, vii. 8; Grätz, 3, 272, seq.; Derenbourg, p. 217.
[2] Ant. xvii. 2, 3.

liked so much at Rome far more interesting than the hair-splitting syllogisms of his Rabbi friends. Not only did he build a theatre and a circus for the heathen in Berytus, and at their dedication make 1400 men (all criminals, as he was careful to point out for his reputation's sake) fight to the death,—Cæsarea itself was soon defiled with the same heathen abominations. One teacher alone, Rabbi Simon, had the courage to protest against these transgressions of the king who was so good a Pharisee in Jerusalem. He proposed to exclude him from the temple. On hearing of this, Agrippa sent for the Rabbi to Cæsarea, and made him sit at his side in the theatre. At the end of the performance, he put him this sophistical question: "Say, Rabbi Simon, what takes place here contrary to the law?" Of course the law said nothing about a circus. The Rabbi was mute; overwhelmed, he begged pardon of the king, and was dismissed with gifts. The Rabbis, however, now sanctioned what they could not prevent, and let the king enjoy the sanguinary gladiatorial shows with which they had so bitterly reproached his grandfather Herod.

Agrippa repaid them all the more readily when the time came to support them against their enemies. Thus the Jews heard with indignation that the old attacks on the synagogues had begun again in the Phœnician Dor on Carmel. During a persecution of the Jews, the Gentiles had stormed the house of prayer and set up in it a bust of the emperor. Immediate measures were needful to prevent a repetition of the former disasters. The great king went in person to Antioch with a zeal that would have done honour to any Rabbi, and induced Petronius to send a centurion to Dor to demand the surrender of the culprits, and in case of refusal to treat the archons themselves as guilty. It was only thus that the last sparks of this great conflagration were stamped out. In the same way the king seems to have extended his support to the Samaritans against the hatred of the Jews. At all events, the violent outbursts of popular hate which broke out in Cæsarea and Sychem after his death, show

that he must have gone to considerable lengths in protecting them against the hatred of the Jews.

In the same effort to win popularity, he further gave up the Christian communities to the fanaticism of the masses. The Acts of the Apostles tell us in plain and homely words: "About that time Herod the king stretched forth his hand to vex certain of the church. And he killed James the brother of John with the sword; and because he saw it pleased the Jews, he proceeded further to take Peter also." In this passage the motives of this first Christian persecution are correctly stated. "Because it pleased the Jews," was the only reason for assailing a community whose religious expectations must have been perfectly indifferent to him.

Such was the policy of subservience to fanaticism, with which Agrippa succeeded in reconciling Israel to the house of Edom. The Pharisees themselves traced their victory to the piety of the king; and though formerly the Herods' most implacable enemies, they now remained devoted to the dynasty, even though Agrippa's son, logically carrying out his father's policy, made the discovery that the true Israel was to be found in Vespasian's camp. It is well known what signal vengeance the Zealots took upon them for their equivocation.

It certainly remains somewhat obscure whether Agrippa, on finding himself at one with his people, did not venture to take some slight steps towards establishing his power on its own basis and doing away with Roman support. At all events, the proconsul of Syria, C. Vibius Marsus, who succeeded to the Jews' friend Publius Petronius in 42, thought he discerned some such inclinations in the Jewish king. One indication was the completion of the fortifications of Jerusalem. The weak side of the city was Bezetha, the new town to the north. Agrippa began to surround it with walls of hewn stone. By general consent, their completion would render the city impregnable.[1] To get the work in hand at all was only possible by bribing the

[1] Bell. ii. 11, 6; v. 4, 2.

Roman minister. In after times, during the war, the Romans were fain to curse "the greed of Claudius' time, when his freedmen sold the Jews their right of fortifying themselves, and in time of peace let walls be built as if for war."[1]

The works when finished were ten yards thick; the masonry was so fitted together that it could neither be wrenched apart by crowbars nor battered down with rams. The height was fully seventy-five feet. When the new proconsul Marsus saw this fresh project of his neighbour, he sent a report to Claudius notifying the erection of a first-rate fortress in a place threatened neither by the Arabs nor the Parthians, so that it could only be intended against Rome, and indeed seemed expressly designed to support a future insurrection. Rome then interfered, and it was not for twenty-five years that the proud foundations were scantily completed, as far as haste allowed. Agrippa can never have dreamed of actual revolt from Rome; the cities that called him Philo-Cæsar or Philo-Claudius on their coins must have known that in these words they touched the summit of his ambition.[2] Moreover, he never met with unmixed approval of the new building from his friends among the Pharisees, for they refused to consider Bezetha as part of the Holy City, as it had not been consecrated and sanctified like the old Jerusalem by the presence of David, the prophets, Urim and Thummim, and the seventy members of the Sanhedrin.[3]

When once the new administration at Antioch had adopted an attitude of suspicion, Marsus was not long in fancying he had discovered other threads of secret intrigue. In the year 43, the neighbouring vassal kings met in conclave beside the Lake of Gennesareth. Here was an assemblage of potentates who could hardly intend to rebel against Rome, but perhaps thought they had common interests to defend against the proconsul of Syria. This meeting at Tiberias comprised Antiochus of Commagene, Sampsiceramus of Emesa, Cotys of Lesser Armenia, Polemon of

[1] Tac. Hist. 5, 12. [2] Eckhel, iii. 491; Keim, loc. cit., iii. 55.
[3] Derenbourg, 219.

Pontus, and Agrippa's brother, Herod of Chalcis. They were disagreeably surprised by the announcement of the proconsul's approach. Mindful of their duty, the kings at once went seven stades to meet him; but the very fact of their driving out together in one vehicle was another suspicious circumstance in the eyes of the proconsul. He sent each of them a warning to return home, as the meeting had all the appearance of a conspiracy. After this deadly insult, Agrippa demanded the recall of Marsus, but in vain. Neither his consular rank, nor the treaty which Claudius had made with him "publicly in the forum," availed to protect him from insult in his own house on the part of his confederate's official. On the other hand, this conflict with Marsus produced one evil result for his dynasty. Rome began to regret the creation of a strong state in this quarter, and resolved to reduce it after Agrippa's death.

The opportunity came in the very next year. Agrippa had occupied the throne for three years, when, according to the history of the Acts, he went to Cæsarea, to settle affairs with the people of Tyre and Sidon, with whom he had a quarrel. These great centres of commerce could not long bear the embargo he had laid on corn, and begged for peace through the good offices of Blastus, the king's chamberlain. Their envoys were received by Agrippa in royal state upon his throne. When he began to speak, there rose from the crowd of flatterers the cry that had so often greeted Caligula: "It is the voice of God, not a man!" Immediately he was struck by the angel of the Lord, because he had not given the honour to God.

According to Josephus, however, Agrippa meant to attend the games in honour of the emperor's safety, which had been decreed by the senate for Claudius' Britannic victories in the year 43, and were actually held at Rome early in 44, after the emperor's return.[1] With his usual love of display, the tyrant, who found a revenue of twelve millions insufficient, appeared on this occasion in a robe worked with silver. As it glittered in the sun,

[1] Dio, 60, 23.

the courtiers cried: "Thou Godhead, be gracious to us. Till now we have feared thee as a man; henceforth we recognize thee as more than mortal." Their words were a reminiscence of Caligula's time; and Agrippa, who thought himself no whit inferior to his friends Caius and Claudius, deigned to be pleased by the acclamation. Then, according to Josephus, too, a portent took place. He was not smitten by the angel of the Lord, but carried off by a prodigy. While a prisoner at Tusculum in the last years of Tiberius, a German had shown him an owl sitting above him in the court-yard of the castle. The next time he saw this bird he would die. Now in the midst of his gratification at these words of flattery, he looked up, and in his pavilion saw the bird swinging from a cord overhead. Instantly a sharp pain pierced his entrails like a sword, and, stung by conscience like a true Jew, he cried to his retinue, "Lo, your God must now depart from life, and hurry at once into nothingness." In both accounts we can discern an obscure tale of the interposition of a higher and avenging hand in his sudden death. One reproduces the version of the high-priest's palace; the other, what was current in the humble street where stood the home of the Christian Mary, mother of John Mark. Moreover, the angel who at the same time opened Peter's prison and restored the captive Nazarene to his friends, may well have been identical with Agrippa's angel of death. For the Oriental custom whereby at every change of government the prisons were emptied and the victims of oppression avenged themselves, was carried out to the full on this occasion as on others.

The Jews and Pharisees were now struck with despair. They besieged the palace of Cæsarea with their outcry, kneeling in sackcloth and ashes, wailing and praying for the life of their holy king. Meanwhile, no sooner had the news of the king's death been spread abroad on the fifth day, than the Greeks and Samaritans, overjoyed at their enemies' disaster, broke out in open rebellion. The nobles, crowned with garlands and perfumed with unguents, celebrated the event with banquets, drinking

witty toasts to Charon for having ferried the king of the Jews across the Stygian flood from which no traveller returns. Passages from the pious king's private life were also touched upon; but Josephus declares himself too modest to repeat them. The mob, for their part, stormed the palace; seized the statues of the king's daughter, and set them on the roof of houses of ill-fame, where women of the town had been wont to stand, besides committing other unseemly outrages. The same sort of thing took place at Sychem. But the chief share in the disturbances at Sychem and Cæsarea was taken by the troops, possibly because they too were disgusted with the Pharisaic sanctimoniousness of the old debauchee. On the other hand, the small body of Christians, who had suffered most from Agrippa, contented themselves with drawing a most frightful picture of his death, transferring to him the popular story of having had his body, like Antiochus in olden times, consumed alive by worms.[1]

After this decisive expression from those who were not Jews, there can remain no doubt that the deliberate abettor of Caligula's mad extravagances at Rome was no saint at Jerusalem. The panegyrics of the Pharisee Josephus and the Rabbis of the Talmud only mean that then, as now, *good* government was not necessary to find favour with the party of piety. Yet the true state of affairs occasionally comes to light even in Josephus. Herod and his son Agrippa had taken great pains to improve the condition of Trachonitis, and the frontier colony of Bathyra in Batanæa had contributed to this result. Josephus says roundly that Agrippa ruined this creation of his predecessors by his inordinate taxation,[2] in face of which we meet, characteristically enough, with an inscription from this neighbourhood, in which Agrippa exhorts the people of Trachonitis to wisdom and virtue in words of unction.[3] "They consume widows' households and for a pretence make long prayers," was the judgment already passed by Jesus on Agrippa's partizans. Thus we read

[1] Acts xii. 21, seq.; 2 Macc. ix. 9. [2] Ant. xviii. 2, 2.

[3] Le Bas et Waddington, Inscr. Grecques et Lat. Tom. iii., 1870.

here how the king who had ground down the men of Trachonitis with his imposts, reproaches them with their savage life, comparing their existence and their dwellings to those of wild beasts, and recommending them the blessings of humanity. For these same "brutes" he builds temples, erects statues, and writes inscriptions in his own and the Cæsars' honour,[1] until their houses were ruined by sheer marble, and the inhabitants crept away once more to their old caves. His government of Judæa was much the same. Widespread impoverishment and famine, called by the Christian Church the famine of the third seal, followed the first bad harvest in the very year of his death, for the requisite conditions had been assiduously fostered by the "pious king."

Yet to this day he remained the "good king" in the eyes of the Jews. Josephus reiterates his complaints about the oppressive taxes of the first Herod; yet when Agrippa exacts twice as much, and still with twelve million drachmæ of revenue dies in debt, it is mere magnanimity on his part, as if the first Herod had consumed the money itself. It is sacrilege for the elder king to change the high-priests; regularity itself for his successor to appoint and depose three high-priests in as many years. The Talmud, indeed, has a story of a priest whose hands Agrippa cut off for using them to make an unseemly gesture at him. But even this is excused, because this unworthy priest used to sacrifice in gloves to avoid soiling his hands.[2] So, too, with the heathen games. They had driven the Maccabees of Herod's time to revolt, and more than once had put his life in danger from the dagger of the Pharisee. With Agrippa, they are not contrary to the law; nay, Josephus himself admires the butchery at Berytus, when in a single day the great king freed the world from fourteen hundred malefactors.[3] Thus in dealing with this court, Pharisaism develops its fullest capacity of straining at gnats and swallowing camels, for such conduct was most conducive to the glory of God. As long as the food market of

1 Waddington, loc. cit., 2329.
2 Derenbourg, 210, 212.
3 Ant. xix. 7, 3.

Jerusalem was undefiled by secular tolls and the houses of the Holy City untaxed, the priesthood looks on with edifying indifference at the starvation of the peasantry in the country round.

Lastly, the family life of the king discloses that side of Pharisaism which Jesus had known. Again a whited sepulchre; pious inscriptions without, corruption and putrefying exhalations within. Not one of his daughters gave her hand to a suitor before he was circumcised;[1] none the less, they all deserted their husbands afterwards. The eldest in particular, Bernice, fulfilled every precept of national ritual, from weekly fasts to Nazirite vows. She is praised by Josephus in the Jewish War as a type of devout virtue. Withal, she lived in incest with her brother, after the example of her Roman friends, and finally became the notorious mistress of Titus. Her sister Drusilla was married to prince Aziz of Emesa, on whom she bestowed her hand because her intended bridegroom could not bring himself to circumcision. Aziz, however, did not keep her long; led away by Simon Magus, she gave herself to the procurator Felix. The third sister, Mariamne, also forsook her husband, to attach herself to a rich tax-farmer of Alexandria. The only son and heir, Agrippa, was a lad of seventeen at his father's death. He had grown up in Rome under the protection of Messalina, and the half-witted Claudius prided himself particularly on having formed and educated the young man.[2] Claudius himself was not disinclined to let him succeed to his father's throne, as he had sworn to the latter; but the slaves who passed for statesmen in Rome, such as Narcissus, Pallas and Felix, resolved that Judæa must be taken under the direct protection of Rome. The emperor, used to subordinate his views to those of his freedmen, restored the procuratorship, and put off his pupil with hopes for his coming of age. Soon, however, the ensuing disturbances among the Jews proved how far more discernment the emperor showed in this matter than the servants he had elevated into statesmen.

[1] Ant. xx. 7, 1.

[2] Ant. xx. 1, 2.

With the renewal of heathen domination, the religious question re-appeared in its whole extent. This tide of religion had not ceased to flow even in the times in which the public eye was rivetted on high politics. Only it had been confined to a narrow channel; but thus narrowed and deepened, it had accomplished remarkable results in this one decade.

---

9. The Eastern Dispersal.

During Caligula's struggles with Palestine and Jerusalem, many an eye had turned in hope or grief to the kingdom of Parthia and the vassal states on the Euphrates, where Judaism raised its head more boldly than elsewhere. Petronius had already warned the Roman government against provoking the hostility of a nation which exercised such wide influence in the East.[1] The very country where the Jewish patriarchs once pastured their flocks, saw the richest fulfilment of the promise made to Abraham that his seed should be in number as the sand of the sea-shore.[2] Here, too, Jewish customs, Jewish faith, Jewish prosperity, had outlasted the dominion of Chaldæa, Persia and Syria. Jewish power and numbers had grown through the commerce of the Euphrates, the caravan trade, and the important manufactures of Babylon with its cosmopolitan interests. The steppe supplied the great cities of Parthia with natural products, skins and wool. Rugs, carpets and instruments, were therefore carried westwards by caravan, southwards by boat down the Euphrates. The great merchants, who acted as agents in this traffic, belonged for the most part to Jewish houses. Even political communications between Susa and Rome sometimes passed through their hands.[3] The Chaldæans were distinguished among

1 Philo, Leg. ad Cai. Mang. ii. 578.
2 Jos. Ant. xi. 5, 2; xv, 2, 2; xviii. 9.
3 Bell. i. 13, 5; Ant. xx. 4, 1, seq.

the Jews themselves for their self-assertion. They were rather inclined to regard the restoration under Zerubbabel, Ezra and Nehemiah, as a purging of their own country. They had enriched the canon with historical, prophetic and lyrical contributions, as well as apocrypha such as Baruch, Tobit and Judith; while the whole Babylonian Talmud attests in later times the equality between eastern and western Judaism in literary pursuits.

Now at the very time when heathen Egypt was rising against Israel, the Jews in Mesopotamia were destined to undergo a baptism of blood such, according to Josephus, as had never before been recorded in their annals.[1] Their insolent and aggressive tone, their oppressive superiority as capitalists, which had rendered them odious in Alexandria, were no less fatal to them in the East. The first centre of disturbance was Naarda on the Euphrates, where it was the custom to deposit the temple-tax. The young Jews of military age used to act as an escort to the festal caravans, to protect the temple treasure from the marauders of the desert. Thus a lofty and defiant spirit had grown up among the younger Jews. About the year 18 A.D., these elements were led by two young men, Asinæus and Anilæus, who preferred the life of the free-lance on the steppe to the lash in a Babylonian carpet manufactory. The young adventurers fortified an island in the Euphrates, and began to plunder the wealthy cattle-farmers of the locality. The satrap of the province would have put down these banditti, but his plan, which rested on their observance of the sabbath, was frustrated by their want of orthodoxy. Thereupon king Artabanus acquiesced in the establishment of the two brothers as an armed colony to check Rome and keep the Bedouins in order, thinking at the same time to use the little town of the Jews as a support against the satraps' tendencies towards independence, which now and again broke out in rebellion. New strongholds were now built; and for the next seventeen years the possession of these fortresses secured Jewish supremacy throughout Mesopotamia.

[1] Ant. xviii. 9, 1.

But in the last years of Tiberius, discord broke out in the colony. Anilæus had assassinated a neighbouring satrap for the sake of his beautiful wife, and taken the idolatress into his own house. Thereupon the orthodox elders made representations to him; and fearing that her brother-in-law Asinæus would declare against her, the fair Gentile made away with him by poison. Anilæus then tried to obliterate all remembrance of the deed by a glorious campaign directed against no less a man than the son-in-law of the great king. But after short-lived success, the Jewish hero fell. Immediately persecution of the overbearing nation broke out on every side. This first visitation fell heavily on the Jews. They were compelled to flock into the chief towns of Babylon, Seleucia, Ctesiphon, Naarda and Nisibis. Peace indeed was restored until Caligula's time; but now it was the Greeks who egged on the Parthians and Syrians to the same persecutions as they had stirred up among the Egyptians. Every place was filled with unmeasured hatred of the Jews; and then the persecution broke out with the irresistible rage of primal savagery. In Seleucia alone, 50,000 Jews were massacred, and the persecution was marked by equal atrocity in other cities of Parthia.

The rapid increase of Jews in the neighbouring vassal states and in Syria is perhaps connected with these events. Philadelphia, Adiabene, Chalcis, Syria—above all, Damascus—were flooded with them. In Philadelphia, great struggles took place between Jews and Gentiles immediately after the death of Herod Agrippa.[1] In Adiabene, the lawyers succeeded in converting queen Helena and her son Izates, who indeed, as king, underwent circumcision.[2] Chalcis, too, and Lesser Armenia were under Jewish supremacy, thanks to the arrangements of the Roman court. Of Damascus, Josephus says with pride that all the women attached themselves to the Jews;[3] and when the Arab Aretas made himself master of the town, he granted the Jews an ethnarch of their own.[4] From these border provinces

[1] Ant. xx. 1, 1. [2] Ib. ch. ii. [3] Bell. ii. 20, 2. [4] 2 Cor. ii. 32.

the Jews were soon able to re-establish their old influence over the kingdom of Parthia, so that in the struggles between the two great powers, both sides solicited the alliance of the provinces dominated by them. No later than Trajan's great war in the next century, the Romans were to learn the full meaning of Jewish opposition in these provinces.

The religious fermentation called into existence by Jewish influence in the east no less than the west, can be traced by several indications, historic or legendary, in the New Testament history. Belief in the appearance of the Christ makes its way rapidly to Damascus and Antioch. Paul retires into the country east of Peræa, called Arabia by the Romans. Parthians, Medes, Elamites and dwellers in Mesopotamia, are endowed by the author of the Acts with the gift of tongues at Pentecost. In the Gospel, the Magi from the east are made to pay homage to the Christ-child, thus indirectly signifying the path which Christianity took to the east, while we are only able to follow its westward track.

Fourth Division.

THE FATE OF CHRISTIANITY IN PALESTINE.

THE FATE OF CHRISTIANITY IN PALESTINE.

1. Reaction of the Messianic Movements.

Alexandrian Judaism, combating polytheism on grounds not only of religion but still more of philosophy and a scientific view of the world, had aimed at giving its contemporaries a logical, rhetorical and philosophic proof of the belief in one God, revealed in Moses. But its prophecy was still unfulfilled—the boastful prophecy that by dint of these arguments the world would be converted to Judaism as the only reasonable religion, and the only one in harmony with the laws of nature. Cultured society would not accept philosophic truth in the imperfect guise of scarcely intelligible symbols. The masses found a stumbling-block in the mere thought of being burdened with Jewish observances. Gentile hatred had therefore broken out at last in its deadliest form in the very place where Judaism had done most to rationalize its religion and make it accessible to the Gentile. After the violent struggle under Caligula, Hellenism had every reason to delay its project of universal conquest. Aversion to the Jews had become intensified throughout the empire, no less than the horror of the Jews for the heathen. Herod Agrippa, the mediator, was himself forced into strict observance of the law, while any desire to extend the promises of Israel to the Gentiles was further off than ever.

But even if the conflict of these latter years had not taken place, a monotheistic church would never have come into existence along the lines of Hellenistic enlightenment. For however great the results of speech or writing, religion never was the

product of rhetoric or organization. Religions must grow up as the conviction of an actual revelation; they do not admit of demonstration, for they are of the nature of emotion, not science. Only where thought has re-modelled itself in the unconscious form of belief in a given reality, does there spring up that sense of dependence which we call religion. All the postulates of a scientific consciousness can be satisfied in this emotional form of belief in a revelation actually given; but this belief is not precious to the believer because it is reasonable, but because his spirit is enveloped and filled by the mediator or the first gospel of this revelation. Again, it is only in this emotional form of personal envelopment that religion can be propagated. Hellenism therefore might add volume to volume, speech to speech; but the critical question was not how far Judaism was reasonable, logical and venerable, but rather, whether one of the existing Jewish congregations had received a religious impulse of far-reaching power, so as to make its influence felt over a wide area. The negative property of compatibility with the philosophic consciousness of the time—one great advantage, of course, possessed by the Jewish religion—needed re-inforcement by the creative power of a religious personality, to whom all hearts should respond and all spirits cry: "Thou art the way, the truth and the life; none cometh to the Father but through thee."[1] There must appear one in whose presence the thirsty soul should feel, "Where shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life."[2] Whether Judaism was to become the religion of the world depended on the further question, whether any man in Israel was ready to exercise this influence over the heart.

No more lasting religious impulse, then, was perceptible in Hellenistic Judaism, in spite of the fierce struggles with the heathen powers; while in Judæa, of course, the spirit of the old covenant once more worked strongly among the Hebrews.

We have seen under what conditions the belief of Israel in the world to come revived in Judæa; how the promised

[1] So the Hellenistic Gospel, xiv. 5, 6. [2] John vi. 68.

kingdom of God was not merely expected as something to come, but even regarded as something present and existent. Never in the consciousness of this race had heaven stood so close to earth. Above all, the party of Judas the Gaulonite, which aimed at liberating Israel by force of arms, had formed the design of establishing the kingdom of God in the country when once freed from the domination of the heathen. Led by the sons of the great patriot, James and Simon, Menahem and Eleazar, this party continued to struggle with high hopes. But their hopes were fallacious. They might destroy the earthly Jerusalem, but they failed to bring down the heavenly city.

Besides this school of the Zealots, by far the most prominent factor in political life, this new period had received several specific religious impulses from the stormy times of Pilate. The Jewish land was then agitated through its whole extent by the dream of the approaching kingdom. In Judæa, we saw John the Baptist making preparations for the establishment of the kingdom. In Samaria, the whole population followed the prophet of Tirathaba to Gerizim, to seek for the insignia of royalty hidden there by Moses, which were to come to light again in Messianic times; while in the valleys of Galilee, Jesus' disciples announced that the kingdom was near at hand.[1] John was beheaded; the pilgrims to Gerizim massacred; Jesus crucified. Was it possible for the movements they had evoked to hold their ground after the common fate of their founders?

In no case was this absolutely true. The baptism of John had of course ceased to exert an influence upon the popular mind, and no general movement towards baptism, such as that of the year 34, arises again from any similar starting-point. Yet such Baptists do not entirely vanish from the field of history. Besides the Essene communities on the Dead Sea, which maintained similar tendencies of asceticism and expectation of the kingdom, various isolated ascetics stand in close affinity to the Baptist. Thus Banus, the teacher of Josephus, who had settled in the

[1] Cf. Vol. II. pp. 79, seq., 93, seq., 123, seq., 128 (Eng. trans.).

wilderness near Jerusalem in the time of the emperor Claudius, was clad in the bark of trees, lived on wild herbs, and bathed day and night in cold water.[1] The very fact that his pupil Josephus mentioned the Baptist, yet passed over Jesus, suggests that this Hemero-baptist stood in some relation to the movement begun by John.

But the school of the Baptist, in a narrower sense, lasted for several generations. Faithful to their dead master after his arrest and execution,[2] John's disciples kept alive his idea that the kingdom was at hand, and could be introduced by fasts, vigils and sincere repentance. Thus the school of John, with their earnest asceticism, on which they prided themselves, were held up by the Pharisees as an example to the cheerful prophet of Galilee.[3] The two streams, rising so near one another, will unite no more. The school of John and Banus see vengeance for the murder of their prophet in the disasters of Antipas' invasion;[4] while the Christians see in it the woes of the last judgment.[5]

The tidings of the Messiah crucified made their way among the Dispersion, but communities also gathered round the baptism of John abroad. About the middle of the fifties, Paul finds in Ephesus a church of Baptists who had not yet recognized Jesus as the Messiah, nor heard of the development of the idea of the kingdom among his disciples; while the latter recognize the principle of inspiration poured out upon their church as the Holy Ghost, which, according to the prophets, is to be poured out upon all flesh in the time of the Messiah. The former say, "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost."[6] Nevertheless, persons of distinction belonged to the Baptist church, such as Apollos of Alexandria, who was converted in Ephesus by Roman Christians, so far as to recognize Jesus as the Messiah, yet not without repeated efforts to introduce the special practices of the Baptists into the Christian

[1] Jos. Vita, 2.
[2] Matt. xi. 2; xiv. 12.
[3] Matt. ix. 14; Mark ii. 18; Luke v. 33.
[4] Ant. xviii. 5, 3.
[5] Matt. xxiv. 6.
[6] Acts xix. 2.

church.[1] Thus the impulse once given continued to be felt beside the influences which issued from Jesus.

Further, the definite statement of the oldest Christian writings shows that the Baptist church remained long unchanged. They fast as much as the Pharisees; they expect the bridegroom and find him not; they patch the garment of theocracy with a piece of unfulled cloth, only to make the rent worse; they pour the new spirit into old bottles, and the wine is spilt.[2] They ask concerning Jesus, but never resolve their doubts;[3] while the Christians for their part are convinced that John himself said to the people "that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus."[4]

In particular, during the latest period of New Testament writings, occasional references throughout the fourth Evangelist show that in his locality the school of John was of considerable strength, and that its rejection of the Messianic claims of Jesus were a matter of importance to the writer.[5] In fact, the first three chapters of his work are devoted to proving that John was not "the Light," but bare witness to the Light, and that he belonged to the old order which must give way to the new.[6] Undoubtedly it is the continued representation of John in this character, after the lapse of a century, that the Baptist is made to controvert with his own lips (John i. 20) when "he confessed and denied not, but confessed" he was not the Christ, nor even Elias, not again that prophet, but merely the fulfilment of the words of Isaiah: "The voice of one crying in the wilderness, 'Make straight the way of the Lord.'"[7] As against the Baptists, the followers of Jesus asserted that John never intended to found a church of his own, and that baptism with water was not enough, but must be supplemented by regeneration through the Holy Ghost. On the other hand, the

[1] 1 Cor. i. 15—17. [2] Matt. ix. 14—17. [3] Matt. xi. 2.
[4] Acts xix. 4. [5] Ewald, Gesch. des V. Isr. vii. 172, 241.
[6] Cf. Holtzmann, in Schenkel's Bibel-Lex. iii. 324, seq.
[7] Cf. ibid. iii. 324, seq.

Baptists taunted the Christians with the fact that Jesus had borrowed the rite of baptism from their master, and was, in fact, his disciple. It is with reference to such taunts that the author of the fourth Gospel makes John himself refer to the judgment of God as follows: "A man can receive nothing, except it be given him from heaven. He must increase, but I must decrease. Ye yourselves bear me witness that I said, I am not the Christ, but that I am sent before him. He that hath the bride is the bridegroom."[1]

So in the time of Hadrian the two schools continued the struggle on equal terms, so that to the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews the dispute about "baptisms" is a matter of elementary instruction of which his hearers have heard enough.[2] At the time of the Acts, of course, we see from the references to the Christians at Ephesus[3] that here and there the Baptists had united with the church of Jesus in the great cities; but complete fusion was not attained. Instead of this, we meet later with a party named Hemero-baptists, whose ideas are essentially those of the Baptist.[4] So, too, Justin still knows of a special school of Baptists, to whom he applies the words of Isaiah, "They honour God with their lips, but their hearts are far from him."[5]

Even, then, if we know no more of the activity of this religious community than that it continued to grow, to fast and pray, to preach repentance and baptize into a new life, we must not set it down as insignificant, considering that traces of it are to be found in Ephesus, and before long in Rome also; that men like Apollos belonged to it; and that the preaching of Jesus' apostles in its essential bearings is attached to John's preaching of an approaching day of judgment.

It has a similar affinity with the echoes of the SAMARITAN

[1] John iii. 22—36. [2] Heb. vi. 2. [3] Acts xviii. 24—xix. 7.

[4] Ewald, Gesch. Isr. vii. 172, seq.; Lipsius, Zur Quellencritik des Epiphanios, p. 5.

[5] Justin, Tryph, 80.

PILGRIMAGE TO GERIZIM,[1] only that the Christian church saw in the prophet of Tirathaba not a forerunner, but an imitation and aping of the Messiah. Here perhaps one may find the grain of historical truth underlying the legend of SIMON MAGUS, in a lingering memory of the contemporary Messianic movement in Samaria, which put the rival Christian church in these parts at a disadvantage. The same movement, according to Josephus, bore fruit politically, if nothing else, in the fall of Pilate. Neither the Baptist movement on the Jordan nor the preaching of the kingdom in Galilee had led to direct conflicts with the Roman power; but the form in which the prophet of the Samaritans proclaimed the advent of the Messianic period compelled Pilate to employ coercion. But in his zeal he overstretched the bow, and the shaft recoiled upon himself. He had shed blood on Golgotha with impunity; the slaughter at Gerizim brought about his recall. He is immortalized by the creed of the Christians, but his fall was due to the prophet of the Samaritans. The grievances of the Samaritans justified Vitellius. Pilate was removed, though it may well be doubted whether he had not a better notion of the bearings of this Samaritan movement than Vitellius, fresh from Rome, and without knowledge of the Jewish question.

As to the fate that befell the prophet and leader of the whole movement in its overthrow, Josephus says nothing. The historian can hardly include the Magus among the "leaders and rulers" overtaken by punishment, for, passing him over unnamed, he designated him as a man to whom a lie was repugnant. It is stated, however, in the Acts, that in the year of Paul's conversion, that is, the last year of Pilate, the Christian Philip found one Simon at Samaria, who had long made a great stir there by the use of sorcery, amazing the Samaritans by his wonders and giving out that he was some great one.[2] This same Simon is said by the pseudo-Clementine Homilies to have rejected Jerusalem and exalted Gerizim.[3] Under these circumstances there

[1] Cf. Vol. ii. p. 127 (Eng. tr.). [2] Acts viii. 4, seq. [3] Clem. Homil. 2, 22.

is no improbability either in recognizing the prophet of Gerizim in the Simon Magus of the Acts, who was living at Samaria in the very year 36, or seeing in this statement a reminiscence of the historical fact that in Samaria the preaching of the kingdom of the Messiah came into collision with a prophet who also aimed at inaugurating the kingdom. The probability is increased when Josephus, a little later, shows us a Simon Magus again in Samaria, who can perfectly well be the prophet of Tirathaba, escaped from the slaughter.

After the death of Herod Agrippa, Samaria had come under the administration of Felix, the brother of Pallas.[1] At his court we find a friend of his, one Simon Magus, of Cyprian descent, who probably had been in Samaria for some time, as he is acquainted with the daughters of Herod Agrippa,[2] and is able to win for Felix the beautiful Drusilla, queen of Emesa. Now Justin Martyr, to be sure, names the town of Gitta in Samaria as the birth-place of Simon Magus,[3] but his statements elsewhere about the Magus are so untrustworthy that not much stress need be laid on this. In any case, it is unlikely that several men named Simon should at the same time have made a great stir in Samaria by sorcery, the only difference being that one came from Gitta, and the other from Cyprus. If, on the other hand, the prophet of Gerizim, the sorcerer Simon of Josephus, and the Simon of the Acts, are to be regarded as distinct historical personalities, it is nevertheless certain that the reminiscence of the Christian church has confounded all three into one. In Clem. Homil. ii. 22, Simon Magus is said to have tried to substitute Gerizim for the hill of the temple;[4] while it is clear from Acts xxiv. 24, 25, that the charge of acting as go-between for Felix and Drusilla, made against the Simon of Josephus, is also made against the Simon of the Christians.[5] The latter, like the Simon of Josephus, is active in Samaria, and especially in Cæsarea.[6]

[1] Tac. Ann. 12, 54.
[2] Ant. xx. 7, 2.
[3] Apol. l. c. 26, 34; cf. Clem. Homil. 1, 15; 2, 22; Epiph. Hær. 21.
[4] Cf. Recogn. 1, 57.
[5] Cf. Lipsius, Bib.-Lex. 5, 311.
[6] Cf. Hom. ii. 20, xiii. 8; Recogn. vii. 32, ii. 6, seq., with Jos. Ant. xx. 7, 2.

The great stir made by the prophet of Tirathaba is paralleled by the picture in the Acts of its own Samaritan agitator, as well as by the lasting interest in his activity kept up by Christian reminiscence. As a whole, however, the Christian legend of Simon is dominated by the thought of Simon as the rival of Jesus, parodying his life and death and resurrection; while it is not possible to explain *all* the features of the Simon legend from the parody of Paul's life, into which, as is well known, Jewish party hate afterwards turned the legend of Simon.

This effort of the Samaritan prophet, striking in itself no less than in its historical consequences, to introduce the Messianic kingdom by purely external means and to "establish Gerizim," had so many points of contact with the preaching of the Apostles, that he constantly appeared to them as the rival and imitator of the Gospel, and was represented as such by the Acts, the Clementine Homilies, Justin and Hippolytus. He had aimed at bringing what Jesus brought, at being what Jesus was. This primary impression of his efforts has an obvious effect on the cycle of legends which charge him with imitation of Jesus, and ascribe to him a series of rival miracles, by means of which he tries to prove his Messiahship. In other words, then, it is the old quarrel of Samaritans and Jews about the *true* prophet, the *true* mountain of the temple, the *true* descent from Abraham, the *true* Holy Land—here renewed in respect to the Messiah. Now, too, the Samaritans pretend to have the real Messiah; the movement begun at Gerizim continues throughout the century in new efforts for reform on the part of the Samaritans.

Besides Simon, another prophet is mentioned—DOSITHEUS, who appeared, according to the Clementines, immediately after John the Baptist;[1] according to Origen, in the time of the Apostles.[2] On the other hand, the Samaritan chronicle of Abulfatah places him as early as the time of the Maccabees.[3]

[1] Recogn. ii. 8. [2] Orig. Cels. 1, 57; Op. i. 372.

[3] Silvestre de Sacy, Chrestom. Ar., 2nd ed., Paris, 1826, i. 333, seq.; cf. also Hieronym. Advers. Luciferanos, 23.

At all events, the activity of his followers continues into our era.[1] They, too, are of those who waited and hoped. For, according to the legend, their master had proclaimed the immediate advent of the resurrection,[2] and thought to secure the time of salvation by rigid asceticism and literal fulfilment of the law of God.[3] He gave himself out as one of the prophets foretold by Moses, or, as a later generation put it, the Messiah in person;[4] and in his twenty-eighth year succumbed to the severity of his fasts in a cavern not far from Jerusalem.[5]

Finally, we hear of a Samaritan MENANDER as a direct pupil of Simon. He, if the accounts of Irenæus and Eusebius are to be believed on other grounds, must have introduced the Gnostic speculations of Alexandrian religious philosophy among the Samaritans.[6]

Amid these confused reports, one thing stands out clearly: *the following gained by the prophets who dwelt in the wilderness of Judah and the mountain clefts of Gerizim, were far from being utterly annihilated.* Just as to-day the revivalist movements in the New World, after sweeping over whole provinces, seem suddenly to disappear underground, when they have only stepped aside into the narrow streets of lesser folk, so here the movement of the Baptists and the pilgrimage to Gerizim had shrunk back into a narrow channel before the approaching storms of war. But the stream of inspiration was by no means cut off, although its springs were not copious enough to afford a perennial flow. For it cannot be asserted that the world could have obtained any appreciable revival of religion from the wandering disciples of the Baptist or the restlessness of the Samaritans. Thus we see here how far cognate forms of the Mes-

[1] Orig. In Joann. tom. xiii. 27.

[2] Epiph. Hær. 13, 1.

[3] Orig. περὶ ἀρχῶν, 4, 17.

[4] Eulogius in Photius, Bibl. Cod. 230; Orig. Cels. 1, 57; 6, 11.

[5] Constit. Ap. 6; 8, 1; and the Samaritan chronicle of Abulfatah, p. 337, Sac.

[6] Euseb. H.E. 3, 26; Iren. Adv. Hær. 1, 21.

sianic idea would have extended by themselves, if the Messiah had failed to appear. But he was there, although at first known but to few.

---

2. The Followers of Jesus.

Like the other two religious movements of the years 34 and 35, the third and most insignificant, which alone received no notice from the historians of the Jewish nation, rose up anew after a brief disappearance, to show in course of time that its leader was the champion of God sought by Israel. The insignificant movement of the Galilean preaching of the kingdom expanded in successive decades into the ever-widening stream of the Christian church.

There is sufficient reason for deriving this stream from this particular well-head at Capernaum, and not from the general religious movement of Palestine. What the church established was not the Messianic expectation of Jesus, not even the idea of the kingdom as developed in sublime beauty by Jesus, but primarily the actual personality of Jesus, who made upon his surroundings the ineffaceable and irresistible impression of being he whom Israel needed and hoped for. In fact, it was through this belief in him, this love for him, that the kingdom he described first secured its entrance into his disciples; it was in their personal relation to Jesus that they participated in this kingdom of love, joy, peace and contentment.

No doubt, however, the kingdom still appeared to them as something future. But they had had a foretaste of it in their intercourse with Jesus, and therefore belief in Jesus and participation in the kingdom were to them one and the same. Whoso believes on him shall inherit the kingdom; whoso believes not, incurs judgment. Such is the formula to which they bring their conviction. It is the necessary consequence of their experience. Their whole Christianity was primarily their strong, unbroken

love for Jesus, who could not possibly have deceived them; a love that finds its most triumphant proof in the fact that they waited a whole lifetime for his return.

After the decisive visit to Jerusalem had ended on Golgotha, Daniel's prophecy,[1] which Jesus had taken up, of the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven, was the sheet-anchor at which the little church rode out the raging storm of doubt. Trust in this promise of *return*, however, soon changed into belief in his *resurrection*, which, to the consciousness of the early Christians, was the first condition of his return.[2] This belief had acquired consistency within a few days of his crucifixion, as we learn from St. Paul.[3]

Among the physical explanations of this event, that of an actual resurrection from apparent death is excluded; first, by the spiritual mode of his re-appearance; secondly, by his disciples' expectation of seeing him return upon the clouds of heaven. Moreover, a physical event of this kind would have left a clearer impression on the recollection of early Christianity, with the result that we should have had as clear testimony of it as of the crucifixion; whereas the accounts of the resurrection are vague in character, and agree neither in order, place nor time.[4] This event, so momentous in its consequences, yet told with such inconsistencies, rests essentially upon somewhat unstable circumstances—appearances, visions, the experiences of ecstasy. The vision-hypothesis alone explains the pervading presence of the risen Jesus in Galilee and Jerusalem, in the wilderness of Damascus, and on the waters of Patmos, as well as the long cessation of the appearances and their return in the tension of the Jewish war. We have indeed more than

[1] Cf. Vol. ii. p. 230 (Eng. trans.).

[2] 1 Cor. xv. 23.

[3] 1 Cor. xv. 4. Of course as late as the year 58; but the testimony itself (cf. Gal. i. 19, seq.) asserts that Paul had learned to believe on him who rose again *on the third day* as early as the year 36.

[4] More fully in Holtzmann, Judenthum und Christenth. p. 520, seq. On the other hand, Keim, der geschichtl. Christus, 1866, p. 131, seq.

sufficient conditions given to account for the rapid origin of such visions within three days of the crucifixion.[1]

The pilgrimage of the Galilean community to Jerusalem had taken place at a time when national excitement ran highest. The blood of the Baptist still cried to heaven unatoned for and unavenged. The captive patriots still languished in the dungeons of Jerusalem;[2] the temple scarce purified from the blood of the Galileans butchered by Pilate.[3] Dark rumours, too, from the sacred mountain of the Samaritans made their way among the people, telling how an attempt had been made there to anticipate the true sons of Abraham in the kingdom. While the people were thus restless and painfully agitated, the Galilean believers went up with Jesus through their midst. In their inward experience of Jesus, the disciples had already found what the people sought from others, the final realization of the prophetic promise; and this was now to assume outward embodiment. In the intoxication of joy, their assurance was heightened by the enthusiastic acclamation of the people, the triumphant advance of their Master, and the spiritless retreat of their adversaries. Their hearts "burned" within them with joy and hope. But the marvel by means of which alone the kingdom of heaven could be brought down to earth was not forthcoming. The people cried, "Show us a sign;" and Jesus was silent. Then the adversaries began to lift up their heads again more boldly. The disciples, however, saw how Jesus wrestled in an agony of prayer; he spoke of his body that was broken for them—of his blood that should be poured out for them; and offered assurances of his return, when he should drink of the fruit of the vine with them once more.[4] He showed them from Daniel that the Son of Man would return upon the clouds of heaven.[5] Such were not the thoughts with which they had come to the city; but their faith in him endured this trial like

[1] Cf., for what follows, especially Holsten, Zum Evang. des Paulus und Petrus, Rostock, 1868.

[2] Matt. xxvii. 16, seq.

[3] Luke xiii. 1.

[4] Matt. xxvi. 29.

[5] Matt. xxiv. 15, 33.

the rest. Despite the contradiction of facts, they were true to Jesus because he was true to himself.

But how, then, could God really abandon one ordained to be the Messiah? It was still past their belief. Then came the suprise on the Mount of Olives—God had not warned Jesus; then came imprisonment—God did not set him free; the trial, and God worked no wonder; the crucifixion, and the Son of God did not descend. This was answer enough for the people; but the disciples? They found that the inconceivable had happened. There was but one solution to the riddle of this death, and this might well flash upon them again and again. In the midst of jeering foes, Jesus is reported to have said: "Hereafter ye shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power and coming upon the clouds of heaven."[1] Why now should not this one solution be the real one? A bridge had to be stretched over the fearful gulf which yawned before them: why not this? To a pious mind, the order of the world was upset by this catastrophe to him of whom the third Gospel so finely says: "We hoped he would deliver Israel!" Sooner than believe this man could play them false, they would doubt the evidence of their own eyes. The picture of the Master had stood clear and bright before them; he had given them the best from the treasures of his heart; he had been the same in the days when the multitude extolled him, the same when they shouted for Barabbas. Could this man be a false prophet? Could God have renounced him whom He had Himself prepared to be a prophet like Moses? This gulf needed to be filled up or bridged over; and thus of inner necessity it was spanned by the rainbow of vision. The bright image of their Master, living and shining in their souls, mirrored itself on the dark background of reality; and there was an answer to their heartfelt prayer: "Thou wilt not leave his soul in hell, nor suffer thy Holy One to see corruption." If Jesus was to return and judge the world at the approaching resurrection of the dead, the grave

[1] Matt. xxvi. 64; cf. Rev. xiv. 14.

could not have retained him; and the firm belief that he lived and had not deceived them, rose to the pitch of beholding him in visions, first among the most excitable, finally among all, by the sympathetic bond of a like enthusiasm.

Moreover, this connection of belief in the resurrection with belief in the promised return, was self-established among a generation which was at one with the whole people in expecting the immediate realization of the Messianic prophecies. Twenty years later, Paul sees in the resurrection of Jesus the beginning of the *universal* resurrection, and believes it to have been the starting-point of the last days. For him, too, there lies so short a space between the universal resurrection and that of Jesus, that he already counts Jesus as the "first fruits" and "beginning" of the resurrection, for the universal resurrection has begun at the moment of Christ's.[1] How much more must belief in the promised advent have taken immediate shape among the witnesses of the death, as expectancy of the resurrection of him who was to bring the kingdom without delay,—an expectation accordingly which, in the exaltation of confidence and hope, attained to sight of him in visions.

Such sight of their crucified and buried Master, who still lived so vividly in their hearts, was all the easier because the Jew thought of Hades as less irrevocably closed than the grave as we think of it. The expectation of a universal resurrection penetrated the gates of the under-world. In the period intermediate between death and resurrection the soul was in Sheol, where there were several divisions: "Paradise," "Abraham's bosom," the crypts under "God's Altar," as well as "Hades" and "Gehenna." Yet none of these regions are so firmly barred as to prevent the voices of the godly and the shrieks of the tormented from reaching the teacher's ear.[2] Antipas might fear the risen Baptist in Jesus;[3] the Pharisees might look for the return of Elias;[4] while when Jesus spoke, the people variously

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 23. [2] Luke xvi. 22. [3] Matt. xiv. 2; Mark vi. 14.
[4] Matt. xvii. 10, xi. 14; Mark ix. 11.

thought they had Elias before them, or Jeremiah, or some other prophet risen from the dead.[1] Thus on the occasion of the earthquake after Jesus' death, the Gospel according to St. Matthew relates that the graves opened, and many of the saints that slept went into the holy city and there appeared to many.[2] Finally, the writer of the Apocalypse similarly expects that, after being slain by the multitude, the last witnesses of Jesus in Jerusalem would rise again after three-and-a-half days.[3] Consequently, if resurrection was considered possible in itself, a further condition was given for an appearance of Jesus.

Thus the facts as they stand are easily explicable on the vision hypothesis, if only proof is not demanded as to how the individual appearances, as afterwards related, can be directly established as visions. Indeed, it is the less possible to insist on this proof, as we have not so much as a consistent account of the individual appearances; and, moreover, the existing narratives belong to the second and third generation. Paul, the nearest witness, records the bare fact—at the same time, indeed, placing the appearances of Jesus after his death in the same category as the vision of Christ vouchsafed to himself. Thus the only thing actually attested is what Paul says, that Jesus appeared to Cephas, then to the twelve, and then to more than five hundred persons at one time, most of whom were still living when Paul wrote, but some had already fallen asleep. After this great revelation to the five hundred, Jesus was also seen once more by James and the apostles, and finally he appeared to Paul in the same way as to the rest.

Now it has often been said that whoever considers the appearances after the resurrection as visions of the disciples, declares the Church to be based on deception. But it is one of the worst prejudices sprung from the rationalistic period of theology, to consider that reason and experience are the only sources of

[1] Matt. xv. 14. [2] Matt. xxvii. 52.

[3] Rev. xi. 3—12; cf. Lipsius, Die Grundansch. d. Urgem. Jahrb. d. d. Prot.-Ver., 1871, p. 80.

truth, and that nothing exists in the spiritual world but what can be expressed in terms of reason. It is as great a perversion to neglect the substance of a spiritual life, because presented in the form of a vision, as to ascribe to it a specific value as revelation on the same grounds. There are visions which contain more truth than the clearest demonstrations; and the disciples who realized the Messianic place of Jesus and his significance in the history of the world under the image of his resurrection, knew more of the future and the present than their adversaries, who concluded from the empty sepulchre that the body had been carried away by his followers.

In the same way the visions of St. Anthony, St. Ansgar, St. Bernard and St. Francis, have produced greater historical results than volumes of philosophic investigations. It is therefore thoroughly unworthy of historical criticism to refer the most splendid revolutions in the history of the world to illusions, on the ground that the form in which truth reached the consciousness of the actors in them belonged to the dream-life of phantasy, not to the daylight of logical ratiocination. It is not that the vision produced these historical results; but the active spiritual power of truth drew the thinking subject along with it to physical sight. It is the very nature of the religious process to stir and seize upon the heart and feelings, the imagination and the will, far more deeply than any purely intellectual operations. But this does not imply that such pictorial thought is devoid of truth. In this case, too, it is not as if the appearances after the resurrection, *i.e.*, the illusions of a vision, had founded the church. It would be truer to say that these narratives, like the church itself, were only the consequence of the unshakeable conviction that Jesus was the Christ. This conviction created both dogma and church; and for this reason, belief in the resurrection was not slowly and subtly evolved, but was in existence immediately after the crucifixion, as is shown by 1 Cor. xv. 4, *on the third day*.

From the setting of several Synoptic and Johannine visions, we see, then, that one portion of them took place in Jerusalem,

I 2

another on the consecrated ground by the Lake of Gennesareth and the mountain near Capernaum. But the fact that Matthew places the last appearance, together with the farewell, on the Galilean mountain, while Luke transfers it to Bethany near Jerusalem, plainly shows that no perfectly clear account of these inward occurrences was obtainable, or else the *place, at least, of the last appearance* would have been preserved. What remained firm was the conviction that Jesus lived—that now he revealed himself to individuals—and now, according to his promise, was in the midst of his followers when they were gathered together in his name.

Thus vision kindled vision—one flame, another. An awakening came upon the little society, and assumed an infinitely more stormy and elevated character than had ever been possessed by the movement of the Baptist. None had ever seen the crowds along Jordan so full of storm and stress, in such a ferment of enthusiasm. There was the baptism with water—here, with the spirit; there, the old wine which the old vessels could contain—here, a new wine which fermented and burst them asunder.

Those must have been wild and thrilling moments when the spirit of visionary sight swept through assemblages of more than five hundred believers, so that all beheld Jesus and could still bear witness to him twenty years later. But there is no mention in the Gospels whatever of this particular vision, where more than five hundred brethren were at one in having seen Jesus; and yet it must have been a matter of the greatest importance for the extension of the community and the confirmation of hesitating spirits. Taken by itself, therefore, it is scarcely conceivable that it should have been so utterly lost to tradition. Now if all the historical documents are examined with a view to discovering which narrative contains any reminiscence of this historical event of a vision of many, the account of *the miracle of Pentecost* in the Acts alone has any affinity with the event recorded by Paul.[1] At the first feast of Pentecost after the fatal

[1] Cf. Holtzmann, Judenth. u. Christenth. p. 524, seq.

Passover, there took place an awakening in which the follower of Paul who records it believes he can see the fulfilment of one of the most important Messianic promises. Indeed, he applies to it the words of the prophet Joel: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams: and on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy."[1]

In the opinion of the writer, therefore, this was the occasion on which the church partook of the Spirit of God, the marvellous revelation of which was seen in the gift of tongues. It is in itself highly probable that a revelation of their risen Lord to more than five hundred ecstatic brethren at once found outward expression in those cries of rapture which were afterwards called "speaking with tongues of angels." The Acts itself, indeed, understands speaking in foreign languages by the gift of tongues, transferring to this great awakening on the first feast of Pentecost the picture of the Sinaitic legislation, as drawn by Philo and the Rabbis.[2] For according to Jewish tradition, the law was given on the day of Pentecost, and in such a manner, too, that even the nations who rejected could yet understand it. Now this process, according to the Rabbis, took place either in the form of a miracle of speech, so that, as Rabbi Johanan said, the voice of Sinai divided into seventy languages; or of a miracle of hearing, so that the law was proclaimed with a single utterance, while every nation heard its own language. The peculiar expression, too, in Exod. xx. 18: "All the people saw the voices and the lightnings," gave rise to all manner of vague speculations. Thus Midrash Tillin explains Ps. lxviii. 12 in these words: "As the word went out from Sinai, it was divided into seven voices, and from the seven voices into seventy tongues. As sparks fly hither and thither when a man strikes on the

[1] Joel ii. 28, 29, in Acts ii. 17, seq.

[2] Philo, De Decal. g. Mang. Rabbin. Locc. ap. Gfrörer, Urchr. i. 390, seq.

anvil, even so was there a mighty host of God's voices giving proclamation." Knowledge of this conception is shown as early as Philo, who in his account of the proclamation of the law describes a stream of fire out of which a voice speaks, which voice speaks articulately to each hearer according to his own language.

It would, then, be idle to deny that the Acts, at least fifty years later than Philo, borrowed the surroundings under which the Holy Ghost was poured out from the Rabbinical image of the Pentecost on Sinai. The tongues of fire on the heads of the disciples are the same that once flickered on Sinai and spoke aloud in the language of all nations. But it is quite another question whether the first Pentecost was not in reality marked by a great awakening, which first induced the writer of the Acts to connect the event on Sinai with this first Pentecost of the Christian church, and to permit himself this peculiar fusion of the speaking with tongues and the gift of speech.

There are, of course, several reasons for ascribing the vision of the multitude, mentioned by Paul, to the Pentecost of 35, for five hundred brethren could only have assembled at some general gathering of the people. The first occasion which would see the scattered community re-assembled in any numbers would be the first festival after the fatal Passover. Apart from some such occasion, the followers could not have mustered five hundred strong either in the hamlets of Galilee or in Jerusalem. The relation in which this festival naturally stood to the preceding one, raised expectations of a revelation of the Messiah slaughtered on the Passover, all the more because so many festivals at this time are marked by Messianic movements. Now, too, the tide of religious feeling had reached its highest point among the people, and Pilate was getting ready to deal a decisive blow against it in Samaria. There had already been instances of visions vouchsafed to individuals. So confirmation of them was eagerly awaited. Why might not all true believers convince themselves of the living activity of their Lord? Why, if they

wrestled in earnest prayer, might not the hundreds, each fired by the other, see what various individuals had seen for themselves? Thus, in spite of symbolical additions, it will be impossible to deny some basis of fact to the scene of the first Pentecost as given in the Acts; and as the vision of more than five hundred brethren related by Paul most closely corresponds to the story of the miracle at Pentecost told by his disciple, it must be regarded as the historical nucleus of the latter.

The assertion that the history of the church began with a great success in Jerusalem finds further confirmation in the fact that the Apocalypse, instead of beginning its history of the kingdom with images of grief and longing, has nothing but victory and success to chronicle under the imagery of its first page, representing the time before the war and rumours of war of the year 36. As the Acts sets the Pentecost of 35 among the glorious days of the church, so the writer of the Apocalypse sees the triumphant entry of the Messiah under the first seal of the book of doom: "A white horse, and he that sat upon it had a bow; and to him was given a crown, and he came forth conquering and to conquer."[1] He is immediately followed by the red horse, whose track on earth and re-appearance in heaven were speedily manifested by the following year.

From all these indications it seems that the first re-union of all Jesus' disciples at Pentecost, 35, had been accompanied by some great success, described by the Acts and by the Apocalypse as the descent of the Holy Ghost, without which the continuance of the church would have been hardly conceivable. The days of mourning had given place to a most triumphant certainty of victory. The Messiah had revealed himself; his spirit had assumed the rule of the kingdom. The substantial result, then, of this ecstasy, was the certainty that Jesus was the Messiah; that he revealed himself to any that prayed, expected, fasted or was filled with the Holy Ghost; that he was to return immediately on the clouds of heaven to establish the kingdom.

[1] Rev. vi. 2.

For this cry of the spirit recurs continually: "The Lord is at hand;"[1] "The Lord is ready to judge the dead;"[2] "The coming of the Lord is at hand;"[3] "Yet a very little while, he that cometh shall come, and shall not tarry;"[4] "The night is far spent and the day is at hand."[5] Such was the substance of their visions. The only message they brought was that the prayer taught to the disciples by Jesus himself, "Thy kingdom come," had been heard. The task, therefore, of the general congregations was to do their best to obtain personal knowledge of the living Messiah, who had promised that "where two or three are gathered together in my name, I am in the midst of them." They strove to obtain the Spirit; and by the Spirit the heart was certified of the presence of the Lord and the near approach of his advent.

From this point, onwards, possession of the "Spirit" appeared the specific mark of difference between the disciples of Jesus and the followers of the Baptist. "John, indeed," it was said, "baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence."[6] "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."[7] This is the sense in which the Baptist himself is made to testify in the fourth Gospel: "He that sent me to baptize with water, he said unto me, Upon whomsoever thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and abiding upon him, the same is he that baptizeth with the Holy Spirit."[8] The essential element therefore of all Christians, whether they were Jews or Greeks, bond or free, is that one and all have drunk of this Spirit.[9] Now this distinguishing mark of Jesus' disciples is nothing but the principle of their own enthusiasm, laying extraordinary hold upon them in united hours of intense prayer and painful expectancy of their Lord, and taking shape for them as the Spirit of the Lord, the Spirit of Jehovah which rested upon the prophets of old.

[1] 1 Cor. xvi. 22; Phil. iv. 5. [2] 1 Pet. iv. 5. [3] James v. 8.
[4] Heb. x. 37. [5] Rom. xiii. 12. [6] Acts i. 5, xi. 16.
[7] John iii. 5. [8] John i. 33. [9] 1 Cor. xii. 13.

In the first Epistle to the Corinthians the Apostle Paul has drawn a striking picture of this state of possession by the Spirit. If we ask what was the point of difference between these throngs inspired by Christ and the disciples of the Gaulonite, the enthusiasts beside Jordan or the mountain-clefts of Gerizim, what were the revelations which enabled them beyond all others to command the attention of the multitude, the answer given by the apostle himself and by the Acts is, "By the speaking with tongues." A new phenomenon appeared in the Messianic church, unknown either beside the Jordan or on Gerizim. Once produced, it spread with increasing power. This speaking in tongues is described to us by Paul, the earliest witness, as speech, not with man, but with God.[1] He that speaks in a tongue is not understood by men; but in the spirit he speaks mysteries, which can only be understood by one who also comprehends the groaning of the dumb creation. It is a kind of speech in which consciousness becomes latent, or, as the apostle expresses it, the understanding is unfruitful.[2] In its highest access it becomes a stammering, an inarticulate utterance, compared by the apostle to discordant notes on an instrument without distinction of sounds, so that no one knows "what is piped or harped."[3] But when the Spirit rends the believer, these natural sounds burst unconsciously from his stammering lips. In that as in every age, this manifestation religious enthusiasm seized most violently upon those sections of the population who were not eloquent in speech, the highest and deepest feeling not finding expression as a rule in words, but, as the Epistle to the Romans says, in groanings which cannot be uttered. Now this inarticulate utterance under emotion received the name of speaking with tongues from a passage of Isaiah, which was given a Messianic interpretation. The Jewish language describes the speech of foreigners as outlandish or stammering; and so the prophet (xxviii. 11), threatening the kingdom of Ephraim and Judah with an invasion of the Assyrians, says: "By men of strange

[1] 1 Cor. xiv. 2. [2] 1 Cor. xiv. 14. [3] 1 Cor. xiv. 7, seq.

lips and with another tongue will he speak to this people; to whom he said, This is the rest, and this is the refreshing." So when, in the intensity of united prayer, words were of no more avail to express the ineffable, when the strong ferment of emotion burst forth in an ecstasy of incoherent words, sobs, cries and tears, men recalled the words of the prophet saying, that in the last days God would speak to Israel with stammering lips and strange tongue, and called this ecstatic speech, "speaking with tongues." For as speaking in a foreign tongue was called stammering, so, in turn, broken speech appeared to be words in a strange language; and the utterance of ecstasy was accounted a new language, the speech of angels, which, according to Isaiah, was to be revealed by God in the last days to the children of the kingdom.[1]

Now though this unconscious rapture seems to us rare of its kind, it must be remarked that it was a kind more familiar to the ancient world. Men would give themselves up to the spiritual impulse without reserve, unchecked by the habit of constant reflection. In Syria particularly, the ancient home of prophecy, these Bacchic accompaniments of ecstasy have never died out. They rose high in the holy cry of the heathen to Attis, or in the jubilant shout of the prophetic schools, as to this day they reappear at Jerusalem in the wild abandonment beside the sacred Easter fire, or the senseless fury of the dancing dervishes.

Another example—for it is nothing else—of this unstudied outburst of inspiration, is to be seen in the story of the school of the prophets at Ramah. We see a similar phenomenon, spreading with equal contagion. "When Saul's messengers[2] saw the company of the prophets prophesying, and Samuel standing as head over them, the Spirit of God came upon the messengers of Saul and they also prophesied. And when it was told Saul, he sent other messengers, and they also prophesied. And Saul sent messengers again the third time, and they also prophesied. Then went

[1] 1 Cor. xiv. 21; Mark xvi. 17; cf. Hitzig. Der Proph. Jesaja, xxvi.
[2] 1 Sam. xix. 20, seq.

he also to Ramah, and came to the great well that is in Secu: and he asked and said, Where are Samuel and David? And one said, Behold, they be at Naioth in Ramah. And he went thither: and the Spirit of God came upon him also, and he went on and prophesied until he came to Naioth in Ramah. And he also stripped off his clothes, and he also prophesied before Samuel, and lay down naked all that day and all that night. Wherefore they say, Is Saul also among the prophets?"

It is not implied, however, that this rending of spirit and self-abandonment to an emotional and spiritual impulse occurred only among the Hebrews. Plutarch tells how the Pythia uttered strange words in her trance, calling her countrymen firebrands, the Spartans snake-eaters, men *oreani*, and rivers mountain-drinkers.[1] Æschylus similarly represents Cassandra's dithyrambic condition as a mysterious sobbing and groaning, an utterance of broken words, among which detached phrases indicate the direction taken by the flood of emotion.

It is therefore most unlikely that these throngs of revivalists should in the least have fallen short of the devotees of their time. In Syria and Phœnicia especially, the dithyrambic condition was rather regarded as most admirable and the height of devotional introspection. Yet there necessarily came a time when maturer Christianity held that these manifestations had only been permitted by God as a sign to strike the conscience of the heathen, but could not be an enduring element of edification.[2]

Moreover, they always left a very partial impression on those who did not participate in them. As the people of Jerusalem say in the Acts, "They are filled with new wine," so Paul writes to his Corinthians: "If therefore the whole church be assembled together, and all speak with tongues, and there come in men unlearned or unbelieving, will they not say that ye are mad?"[3]

Paul, however, is far from condemning the manifestation itself. But he too recognizes a praying in tongues, that in his judgment stands higher than any words, and is produced by the Spirit

[1] De Pyth. Orac. 24 (406 E). [2] 1 Cor. xiv. 22. [3] 1 Cor. xiv. 23.

itself. "The Spirit," he says, "helpeth our infirmity; for we know not how to pray as we ought; but the Spirit himself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered; and he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God."[1]

The first manifestation of this kind had something overpowering and surprising for the recipients themselves, simply because it was entirely unpremeditated, the perfectly natural outburst of a real inspiration. The ecstasy was felt as a violent force, overpowering will and consciousness. The wilder the ebullitions of the crowd, and the louder the confusion of prophecy and prayer and speaking with tongues, the clearer were the traces of the Spirit; that Spirit which sweeps where it will, and of which the fourth Evangelist says: "Thou hearest the voice thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh, and whither it goeth."[2]

However, these unconscious revelations of the Spirit differed according to the condition and temperament of those affected. Paul speaks of various kinds of tongues; he compares them to various instruments—the pipe, harp and trumpet, sounding brass and clanging cymbal. Thus it would now be a low weeping and prayer spreading through the congregation; now a moaning and sobbing; now shouts of joy or the moving cry of enthusiasm, outsounding all others like a trumpet-call. In the midst of it all, isolated expressions and exclamations would cast a sudden light on the depths whence the unintelligible cries were outpoured.

A number of such expressions have been transferred to the New Testament Epistles. Most of them refer to the near approach of the Lord; and just as the Jews of Alexandria shouted "Marin! Marin!" to their earthly sovereign, so the cry of the Christians was, "Maran atha!" "The Lord cometh,"[3] or "The Lord is at hand,"[4] or "Abba, Father,"[5] or "Jesus is

[1] Rom. viii. 26, seq. [2] John iii. 8. [3] 1 Cor. xvi. 22.
[4] Phil. iv. 5. [5] Gal. iv. 6.

Lord;"[1] or again there might be heard a passionate "Anathema;" for some, too, travail in ecstasy, and utter words which in the full possession of their faculties they would have kept buried in their breasts.[2]

When some such isolated cry had indicated the workings of the heart in one of the brethren, it was eked out by the interpretation of others. There were regular interpreters, hermeneutæ, who could explain the meaning of the Spirit. The outpouring of prayer, interrupted by sobs and unintelligible through excess of emotion, was eased by the untroubled reason of calm helpers, eloquent in speech. This power of bringing connected order into the inarticulate and disconnected inspiration of others, became in course of time the most prized of all gifts.

But by that time the first and most ardent fervour had given way to a cooler movement. It did not escape calmer judges, like Paul, that the excessive enthusiasm of such revivalist meetings easily passed into the sensuous excitement in which the devotee of Cybele or Attis looked to find the presence of godhead, a state only due to the heightened pulse of their own blood, which clouded their minds and robbed them of volition. The apostle's writings "on those in the Spirit"[3] start with a warning against their headlong abandonment of ecstasy, comparing the blind impulse under which they act to the way in which the Corinthians of old used to approach the idols in the Bacchic orgies, "carried away—even as they were led."[4]

Surveying, then, this first appearance of Jesus' followers in their period of storm and stress, we only see how the thoughts of futurity, the world-embracing powers, implanted in their hearts by Jesus, revealed themselves in an intensified glow of life, an impassioned and lofty mode of existence. We have the picture of a chaotic revival, of which it is impossible to say

[1] 1 Cor. xii. 3.

[2] 1 Cor. xii. 3. For the raving cry of those in the Spirit, "Jesus is anathema," see under "Disturbances at Corinth," in the concluding volume.

[3] 1 Cor. xii. 1—14.

[4] 1 Cor. xii. 1—4.

what form it would have taken. Before us stands a little circle of revivalists, convinced that their Messiah lives, that the spirit of the Old Testament prophets is poured out upon the faithful, and making expectation of the speedy return of the Son of Man the essential point of their life of faith. The members are united in common waiting and preparation to receive him that should come. They anxiously watch the signs of the times; every event is a presage of his coming. In their eyes, time is as a woman who bears the Messiah in her womb and draws near to her appointed hour. Every misfortune is a travailing of the kingdom now coming to its birth. They listen intently and hear the sound of his approach everywhere: "He stands at the door and knocks; he comes like a thief in the night; he comes and tarries not." In spite of all contumely and scorn from the multitude, they hold fast their belief that the Master will return and shall be seen by "every eye, and them also which pierced him."[1] Thus their life is one long breathless expectation, yet at the same time an intoxicating enjoyment of his presence.

As to the outward and visible distinction between the disciples of Jesus and the Baptists, Pharisees, Essenes, and every school, in short, which looked for the kingdom and the Messiah, there was primarily but one difference; the former had already found the Messiah in Jesus of Nazareth, though sharing with the rest the expectation of his return as Daniel's Son of Man. But the very fact of having known him, and of already seeing the beginning of the parusia in his resurrection, made their expectation more impatient and more feverish, fuller of ardour and more certain of fulfilment.

Yet there was an inward distinction as well. Though the outward embodiment of the kingdom was still lacking, the disciples were already citizens of it through their attachment to Jesus. The Messiah had founded the kingdom while he was on earth, and had constituted it by appointing twelve apostles.

[1] Rev. i. 7.

They had entered into this kingdom, and in their present period had to bring themselves into harmony with its laws. Even for this short delay, therefore, before the return of Jesus, they were bound to shape their own lives as the Master had ordained, and as was required by the kingdom, to citizenship in which he had consecrated them.

Such was the first attempt to elevate the principles of the Sermon on the Mount into the law of an actual church, an attempt that fell far short of the ideal, and yet has never again been essayed with such pure intentions.

---

3. Migration of the Galileans to Jerusalem.

The enthusiasm and excitement in which we find the church of the kingdom after the death of Jesus are not only explicable by the death of the Messiah on the cross, but also by the five stormy years following the crucifixion, almost unparalleled in the history of Israel. The community was shaken to its foundations; fate left it no resting-place after Golgotha. One storm after another was discharged upon it. In quick succession came the destruction of the Samaritans, the fall of Pilate and Caiaphas, war and rumours of war on the Euphrates and the Jordan, and the overthrow of the prince who had murdered the Baptist and betrayed Jesus. Each of these events deeply affected the Christian church as such.

Then followed the conquest of Damascus, the death of the emperor, and the consequent fall of the tetrarch and rise of Agrippa, and, finally, Antichrist's attempt on the temple in Jerusalem. All this was compressed into a short five years. Hence the church does not attain to rest; the state of ecstasy continues. If the Messiah overthrows his enemies, must he not be standing there at the gate? If the nations rise one against another, are not these the woes of the kingdom? If the man of

sin is there, shall the Messiah tarry? Such storms as these had been foretold by the prophets as the time of the last suffering; the church must cling the more firmly to the expectation that the end is at hand.

Now a period of high excitement usually leaves but a vague and dreamlike memory behind it. The little church, itself unnoticed in the crowded city of the priests and Levites, at once extensive and full of retired nooks, preserved within itself few clear memories of these early years. They might have cried with the Jews of the exile, "We were as men that dream."

One thing, nevertheless, is as certain as it is remarkable, namely, their migration to Jerusalem. Jesus' disciples were exclusively Galileans. The one exception was Judas, whom the rest therefore regarded as a stranger, and used to call simply the "man of Karioth." Now, however, as is shown not only by the Acts, but by the Epistles of Paul, the whole body of disciples, together with the kindred of Jesus, migrated to the Holy City.

The date of this event is variously given. According to the Acts, the disciples did not return to Galilee after the crucifixion. It is told instead how Jesus appeared and "commanded that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father."[1]

A different version is given by Matthew. There the two women are told, first by the angel beside the empty grave and then by Jesus himself, that they shall find him again in Galilee.[2] In the account of the visions, both in the Gospel according to St. Matthew and in the appendix to the fourth Gospel, which places them on "the mountain" or in the half-light of dawn by the shore of the lake near Capernaum,[3] it is plainly stated that Galilee was the place to which the hopes of the disciples were directed by the women, and that in Galilee they had their first visions.

It follows that they did not *remain* in Jerusalem, but on the

[1] Acts i. 4. [2] Matt. xxviii. 7, 10. [3] Matt. xxviii. 16, and John xxi. 4.

contrary, were directed to *return* to the city—probably at the feast of Pentecost—by visions of their risen Master. Further, the application of the words of Zachariah: "I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad," shows indirectly that Jesus' following had been scattered by the unlooked-for blow on the day of preparation for the Passover of 35, and each had made his way to his own home.[1] The earliest date at which the believers are likely to have re-assembled was when the next feast brought them and the whole nation up to Jerusalem. Then they remained firmly settled there, owing to the results of Pentecost and the consequently strengthened sense of Jesus' impending advent.

To any one who is accustomed to infer the operation of powerful causes from striking consequences, the simple fact of this settlement in Jerusalem proves the existence of mental excitement far superior to ordinary considerations. Nothing less than yearning so vehement as to merge every other consideration could have determined this company of Galilean families to desert home and lands and kindred, exchanging their happy life as fishermen for some handicraft in Jerusalem, the lovely shore of their lake for the bleak highlands of Judæa, their free life on the hill-sides of Galilee for the gloomy walls of the city of priests and Levites. All that is elsewhere of importance and value to mankind, every object of anxious solicitude—nay, even of earnest duty—was left behind and forgotten by them. For the migration of such a colony was no light matter. There are not wanting material reminiscences of the mode in which the departure took place. "There is no man," the Lord is represented as saying in this ancient passage, "that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my sake and the gospel's, but he shall receive an hundredfold now in this time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions; and in the world to come everlasting life."

[1] Zach. xiii. 7, in Matt. xxvi. 31, and Mark xiv. 27.

These definite promises refer, of course, to the circumstances of the first band of disciples, settled in Capernaum and Nazareth, and bound there by ties of marriage and ownership of the soil. For them, such a migration was a real leaving of "house, or brothers, or sisters, or mother, or father, or children, or lands." Besides, the condition of Galilee offered no reason for emigration. We find there anything but an impression of irreconcilable hostility on the part of the people towards the following of Jesus. In this respect the new sojourn in the fanatical city of priests would have been ill-chosen. Thus the reason for the migration can only have been the one given by the Acts, viz., to wait for the promises made by Jesus.[1]

Zion itself was to be the scene of the restoration of David's kingdom. Such was the first principle alike of the Jews and of all the early church. The faithful, therefore, were to await the advent of Jesus in the place where he had once most clearly revealed himself. Besides, this was the only spot permitted them by their office of being witnesses of the risen Messiah to the whole nation. The reason why Jesus had chosen *twelve* disciples was that they should represent the twelve tribes of Israel in the new kingdom. Now, too, the disciples, for their part, profess the task of preaching the new kingdom and the risen Messiah to the twelve tribes by completing the number twelve with a new apostle[2] in place of the traitor, choosing him from among those who had shared in the glad tidings from the first days of the Baptist movement up to the resurrection. Jerusalem was naturally the only proper place for this task, as the whole of Israel gathered here at the successive feasts. Whoever received the revelation that the Lord had appointed the disciples to this end, thereby had knowledge of the whole truth.

From the time of this remarkable emigration onwards, Galilee sinks into the background of the history of the church. Only passing mention is made of it.[3] All sincere believers in Jesus had gone up to Jerusalem. Not only the apostles and their

[1] Acts i. 4. [2] Acts i. 21—26; 1 Cor. xv. 5. [3] Acts ix. 31.

wives were there, but other faithful associates from the days of the Baptist;[1] and besides the families of their acquaintance in Capernaum, the brothers and kindred of the Lord, who belonged to Nazareth, with their families and the mother of Jesus.[2]

Here was the firm basis of a faithful church; they had broken down every means of retreat, and in the strange city devoted themselves throughout their colony to an active propaganda and ardent expectation for the hour of fulfilment.

In any case, this resolution denotes a powerful and lofty impulse; and, above all, a strongly enthusiastic temper, the universal characteristic of this earliest Christian colony. In this connection the lead is taken by Simon Peter himself, whom we first heard of as one of a large family in Capernaum. Of these, at least his wife[3] and his brother Andrew[4] migrated with him to Judæa.

His leadership of the primitive church was no mere figment of later times. Even during his lifetime the Jewish Christians abroad loved to designate themselves after him as "the followers of Cephas," when they wished to set up the authority of the parent church of Jerusalem against foreign authorities.[5]

Next to Peter and Andrew, the most conspicuous part is played by John and James, and by Salome,[6] so passionately devoted to Jesus. Men of action and fiery temperament, the sons of Zebedee are characterized at once by their surname, "Sons of Thunder."[7]

Then come the others, whose character has been sketched already:[8] Levi-Matthew, the tax-gatherer, with his knowledge of letters; Judas, the man of heart and feeling (Lebbæus, Thaddæus); and Simon, called the Zealot.

By this time, too, the apostolic circle had been joined by the

[1] Acts i. 22.
[2] Acts i. 14, xii. 13; Gal. ii. 9; 1 Cor. ix. 5.
[3] 1 Cor. ix. 5.
[4] Acts i. 13.
[5] 1 Cor. i. 11; Gal. ii. 9.
[6] Matt. xx. 20.
[7] Mark iii. 17; cf. Luke ix. 54; Mark ix. 38; Matt. xx. 20.
[8] Vol. ii. p. 79 (Eng. trans.).

brothers of Jesus, JAMES, JOSEPH, SIMON and JUDAS, who during the life of Jesus had regarded his rôle of Messiah as insanity.[1] It is told how in the year 34 these brothers, together with their mother, came to Capernaum, with the intention of forcibly bringing Jesus back to Nazareth on the ground of mental incapacity.[2] When Jesus entered Nazareth, these brothers still seem to be unconverted, as the unbelieving congregation appeal to them, and draw from Jesus the complaint that a prophet is nowhere without honour "but in his own country and among his own kin and in his own house."[3] But after the crucifixion it is another matter. We are told that Jesus appeared to his brothers,[4]—a vision, however, that did not take place till after the general vision of the five hundred. Now, then, the brothers of Jesus, accompanied by their wives, settled in Jerusalem,[5] where James became the chief leader of the church, next to Peter, if not above him.[6]

In the church itself, which grew up round this group of leaders, few names in truth can be recovered, and those from somewhat remote documents. Of some who are mentioned in the time of Jesus, such as SIMON THE LEPER and the SISTERS OF BETHANY, it may be safely asserted that they joined the church. We hear in passing of SIMON OF CYRENE, the bearer of the cross, that his two sons ALEXANDER and RUFUS were characters well known to the readers of St. Mark's Gospel.[7] Of the old followers of the baptism of John, JOSEPH BARSABAS, named the Just, and MATTHIAS, the latter even entered the number of the twelve.[8] According to the Acts, believers found a meeting-place, refugees a shelter, in the house of MARY, who is mentioned there, together with her son JOHN MARK and her servant RHODA.[9]

[1] Matt. xiii. 55, xii. 46.
[2] Matt. xii. 46; Mark iii. 21, 31.
[3] Mark vi. 4.
[4] 1 Cor. xv. 7.
[5] 1 Cor. ix. 4; Gal. i. 19.
[6] Gal. ii. 9, 12.
[7] Mark xv. 21.
[8] Acts i. 21—26.
[9] Acts xii. 12, 13, xiii. 13.

Here once more is a complete family circle attached to the belief in Jesus, for the Levite JOSES of Cyprus, surnamed Barnabas (the son of prophecy), was a brother or brother-in-law of Mary.[1] Barnabas had shown his readiness for self-sacrifice in the church by giving up a piece of land he owned in Jerusalem.[2] He had obtained his honourable name of Barnabas from his eloquence, which seems, however, to have displayed itself with greater fluency in Aramaic than in Greek.[3]

But he was by no means the only orator in the church of Jerusalem. In the earliest days of Claudius, a prophet AGABUS comes down from thence to Antioch to prophesy in the spirit of the approaching famine.[4] Similarly he appears afterwards in Cæsarea, in order to emulate the prophets with certain symbolical acts.[5] Among the prophets of Jerusalem, too, there is mentioned an inspired bearer of the word in SILAS,[6] who afterwards preached the risen Christ in Macedonia with Paul. Another, PHILIP, finds his sphere of work nearer at hand in Samaria, and obtains the distinction of being called an apostle as the founder of Phœnician Christianity. The whole atmosphere of enthusiasm in this early society is reproduced for us by the account of this Philip's household given in the Acts: "He had four daughters, virgins, who prophesied."[7] But the man represented as a prophet endowed beyond all with the gifts of the spirit is STEPHEN, a Hellenist, "full of faith and of the Holy Ghost," "full of grace and power," endowed with the gift of "doing great wonders and miracles among the people," ready in disputation, and an undaunted speaker before the tribunal.[8]

Objections may be raised to the historical truth of one or

[1] Col. iv. 10. For the meaning of the expression ὁ ἀνέψιος Βαρνάβα, cf. Hitzig, John Mark, p. 150.

[2] Acts iv. 36. For the meaning, cf. the mention made in Clem. Hom. i. 9—16, ii. 4; Rec. i. 7; Euseb. i. 12.

[3] Contradictory accounts in Acts iv. 36 and xiv. 12.

[4] Acts xi. 27. [5] Acts xxi. 11. [6] Acts xv. 22.

[7] Acts xxi. 9. [8] Acts vi. 5, seq.

other of these names; still, unquestionable data show that inspiration, force and a spirit of enterprize, were abundantly present in this little community; and as Christianity spread abroad, this strong pulse at its centre was deeply felt alike in Asia Minor, Achaia and Rome. A wealth of marked characters is to be found in this small and outwardly insignificant party. Missionaries by nature, like Philip, Barnabas, Silas, Mark; confessors and martyrs like Stephen and James the son of Zebedee; prophetic spirits like Agabus and the daughters of Philip,—one and all offer a delightful picture of the fulness of inspiration, here devoted to a great end. And though afterwards crowds of equivocal Jewish Christians sallied forth from this centre with the object, as Paul taxes them, of living upon the foreign brethren and driving a trade in the glad tidings[1]—though as many destroyers as founders of the churches poured out of the Holy City upon the Dispersion—still even here the saying holds good that much light means many shadows. But after the many redoubtable characters by whom Jerusalem is represented in the earliest church history, it cannot be said that the persecutors of the Pauline churches are the exclusive representatives of the spirit of Jerusalem.

The fact is, rather, that this community was dominated in the earliest period by thoroughly idealistic views, as is shown by the regulations it laid down for itself.

The Acts, a document of the second century, on which absolute reliance must not be placed without other support, affirms that the colony of Galileans in Jerusalem introduced a general community of goods, whereby they "had all things common, and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men as every man had need."[2] This statement is suspicious solely from the fact that other passages of the same book actually speak again of the private property of individual members of the community.[3] Ananias is free to sell his field or not;[4] Mary,

[1] 2 Cor. x. 13—17, xi. 13, 14.
[2] Acts ii. 44, seq., iv. 32.
[3] Acts vi. 1, xii. 12.
[4] Acts v. 4.

the mother of Mark, retains her house;[1] and when Barnabas puts the money from the sale of his house into the common treasury, it appears an extraordinarily praiseworthy act, and deserving of mention.[2] It only follows from this contradiction, what we know on other grounds, that the writer no longer had a clear picture of the circumstances of the primitive church, and that his sources did not speak of any compulsory settlement of the question of private property.

Still this feature was no invention of his own. Some reminiscence of the old community of goods was preserved in the common meals even among the foreign churches.[3] Those who journeyed from Palestine into foreign lands assumed rights of their own over the property of the brethren as a matter of course.[4] Finally, history displays the empoverishment of the church of Jerusalem as a consequence of their attempt at communism.[5]

Moreover, the tendency of the apostles' preaching, apart from anything else, proves renunciation of separate property to have been among their requirements. We must imagine a church that preached as the rule of life: "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth."[6] "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon."[7] "Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on."[8] "Behold the fowls of the air, for they sow not, neither do they reap. Consider the lilies of the field; they toil not, neither do they spin." "Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or what shall we drink? or wherewithal shall we be clothed? (for after all these things do the Gentiles seek); for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. But seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you. Take therefore no thought for the morrow; for the morrow shall take

[1] Acts xii. 12. [2] Acts iv. 36. [3] 1 Cor. xi. 7.
[4] 1 Cor. ix. 4, seq., xi. 20—34; 2 Cor. xi. 20, xii. 13, seq.
[5] Gal. ii. 10, vi. 10; 2 Cor. viii. and ix. [6] Matt. vi. 19, seq.
[7] Matt. vi. 24. [8] Matt. vi. 25, seq.

thought for the things of itself."[1] "Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses, nor scrip for your journey."[2] "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a merchantman, who when he had found one pearl of great price, went and sold all that he had and bought it."[3] "Go and sell that thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven."[4] "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God."[5] "Every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my sake, shall receive an hundred-fold, and shall inherit everlasting life."[6] "Sell that ye have, and give alms; provide yourselves bags which wax not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not."[7]

A community whose lips thus overflowed with communistic adages and contempt for property, must have given them some practical expression, for these words were not hypocritical phrases, but the outpouring of a genuine feeling. Besides, the whole situation of the Galileans in Jerusalem led of necessity to some such communistic arrangement. Once gathered together here, after selling or giving away their goods, were they to devote themselves again to making money or laying up wealth? What, indeed, was the good of possessions and property when now war and rumours of war proclaimed the end at hand, and the red horseman rode before the approach of the Son of Man? The common stock sufficed for the short time remaining; in the day of the kingdom the Messiah will restore many times over what each has give up for the brethren.

In Palestine, what with the small requirements of the Syrian and the mildness of the climate, this attempt was easier than amongst us. Nevertheless, it presupposes even in Syria a lofty and enthusiastic temper pursuing an ideal not of this world. The whole phenomenon leaves the impression of being an after-growth from the days when Jesus bade his followers despise the

[1] Matt. vi. 26—34. [2] Matt. x. 9. [3] Matt. xiii. 45. [4] Matt. xix. 21.
[5] Matt. xix. 24. [6] Matt. xix. 29. [7] Luke xii. 33.

things of this world. Citizens of the kingdom of God would not enter any more into the primeval struggle between *meum* and *tuum*. Several property, the source of so many detestable sentiments, was to be done away with; the place of Justice, saying, "To each his own," should be taken by Love, saying, "Mine for all."

But harsh reality took bitter vengeance on the children of the kingdom. The first Christian church had now to learn that he who would set himself above the material conditions of life is far more often and far more disastrously recalled to them and punished by them, than one who has come to terms with actuality from the outset. The church was impoverished; a struggle over the support of the poor soon grew out of the ...ng community of goods. The Acts, which are as well acquainted, through the Pauline Epistles, as ourselves with the difficulties in Jerusalem, find in them the origin of the ecclesiastical office of deacon, an office that owed its institution to a difference of opinion over the equal maintenance of Greek and Hebrew widows.

But the cause assigned has a suspicious ring of later circumstances—such, *e.g.*, as are to be seen in the pastoral Epistles, in which the maintenance of widows involves the presbyters in many vexations.[1] The complete subdivision of Jerusalem into seven diaconates is an obvious anachronism, whereby the writer refers the needs and institutions of his own day to apostolic times. He could only have known, what is also attested by the Pauline Epistles, that no little trouble and labour had been caused by the question of "the poor in Jerusalem," so that it was impossible to look back with unmixed pleasure on the source of all these difficulties.

Thus no church made a second trial of community of goods. The only institution universally retained was the common meal, or agape, to which each brought his own provision. In some churches, indeed, this common meal was not taken daily, nor

[1] 1 Tim. v. 4, seq., v. 16.

even then regarded as a community of goods,[1] so that this mere relic of communism now appears as no more than a symbolical act without practical significance.

The custom, however, among Christian families on their travels of regarding the property of the brethren as their own, abroad as well as at home, led to sharp conflicts, till there came a sober time when Paul took credit for neither eating and drinking at the expense of the brethren, nor leading about one of the sisters, a wife, like the rest.

Such was the first contact between stern reality and the idealism of the earliest Christian church. Yet who knows whether circumstances so exceptional were not useful and necessary to keep alive the eagerness and glow of hope that might perhaps have cooled down and suffered extinction far sooner in the sober monotony of gaining a daily livelihood?

The true significance of communion in the church is correctly presented in the Acts as a lofty, inward life of prayer, for the rest moving entirely within theocratic forms. "And they, continuing daily with one accord *in the temple*, ... praised God and had favour with all the people."[2] We hear, too, in the Clementines of continual intercourse on the part of the apostles with the chiefs of the people in the temple.[3] Consequently this lofty religious zeal displayed itself in still more conscientious fulfilment of religious duties; indeed, tradition represents individual apostles as models of legality on this particular point.

But something higher was recognized beyond this. After the last prayers had been offered in the temple, the familiar evening assemblies began. The brethren met in their upper chambers to enjoy the delights of ecstasy, and to be inwardly ravished by the presence of the living Christ. According to the description of such a gathering given in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, we may picture it as noisy and tempestuous, stirred by prophecy and ecstatic speaking in tongues. As an expression of hope and

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 17, seq.; Plin. Ep. x. 96, *stato die*. [2] Acts ii. 46.

[3] Clem. Recogn. ch. 53; Visum nobis est ascendere ad templum, &c.

yearning for the return of Christ, it long survived the loss of its main purpose of edification. Occasionally an edifying description of the great day was produced, or hortatory applications to the life of the individual in the form of comparisons and parables. Indeed, some utterances of this description have been partially preserved to us by being attached to the utterances of Jesus in the Gospel. Thus the comparison, in Matt. xxv. 1, of the wise and foolish virgins directly represents the condition of the church, giving expression to the weary length of waiting. "While the bridegroom tarried," the virgins grew weary, and needed the warning to keep the oil ready in their lamps that they might not be found unprepared at the cry, "Behold, the bridegroom cometh."

To the same source we may ascribe the parable of the widow (Luke xviii. 1), coming continually and importuning the judge for vengeance. Here, once more, the widow is the church, whose bridegroom has been taken away from her, and who begins to chide God. "And shall not God avenge his own elect, which cry day and night unto him, though he bear long with them? I tell you that he will avenge them speedily." The same motive recurs in Luke xvi. 1, seq., a copy, scarcely felicitous, of the parable of the pounds. It is the story of the unjust householder, which arrives at the very doubtful moral: "Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, that when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations."

On the other hand, a truly noble picture of the judgment of the world is drawn in Matt. xxv. 31, from the point of view of such Christians as see Christ no more, and therefore ask: "'Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee?' And the King shall answer and say unto them, 'Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.'" "And he shall set the sheep on his

right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

True, that the additions to the parable may also be discovered in Rabbinical writings;[1] nevertheless, the noble execution shows that a touch of Jesus' creative spirit still survived in the church that was able to speak in such lofty tones.

Another passage of the same kind, however lofty it may be considered, represents later experiences. It originates in the time when doubting brethren begin to appeal to their signs and wonders. Jesus is therefore represented as saying in Matt. vii. 22: "Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity."

There is, then, one central point round which are grouped all the various interests which time could not fail to bring into the church: what would Jesus say to each one at his advent? These few examples from the productions of the primitive church show, too, that the apparent uniformity of their eschatological conceptions was yet capable of varied application to the questions of the day.

Of special *usages* outwardly distinguished by the church, only the supper and baptism can be proved to have existed at first. Common meals were equally customary among Pharisees and Essenes as a symbol of their higher, spiritual fellowship. It was thus, too, that Jesus' disciples came together "to break bread." These meals were originally "love-feasts," "agapes," intended to animate the sense of fellowship, to commemorate the last supper with the Master, and keep alive the hope of his second advent.

This commemoration of the broken body and the blood that

[1] Soh. Chad. f. 45, 2; Jalk. Rub. f. 13, 2; cf. the Commentary on Matt. vii. 22.

was shed, connected by Jesus himself with the bread and the cup, was not long in giving birth to the belief that to partake of it was the means of entering into mystic communion with him. Paul, therefore, not only says of unworthy participants that they eat and drink to their own damnation, but even ascribes the physical suffering and death of certain Christians to the fact of having made no discrimination of the body. As partaking of the body is the means to communion with Christ, so is baptism the means to participation in the spirit. As John had baptized to the kingdom, the disciples of Jesus baptized to belief that Jesus is the Christ.

At the same time it was thought that man was purified from sin by the act of immersion, and endued with the gift of the spirit by the laying on of hands.[1] In the words of the Acts, "When Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues and prophesied."[2]

Baptism, therefore, is a new birth "by water and the spirit," as the fourth Gospel expresses it.[3] We also learn in passing that the church considered one form of baptism more efficacious than the other, so that in this respect the earliest Christianity appears as a continuation of the Baptist movement.[4]

The efficacy of baptism, then, manifested itself in prophecy, speaking with tongues and the working of miracles, which latter was long a special mark of the new community.

The fact that just this earliest time was marked by the gift of miracles presupposes a passionate and enthusiastic response in popular sentiment. According to Paul's unquestionable testimony, the apostles especially distinguished themselves in such displays of power,[5] although it is impossible to be certain how far the individual narratives told in the Acts have undergone re-casting in the course of tradition. So much is certain, however, that Paul counts among the usual manifestations of the Spirit all startling signs and public miracles, the gift of healing,

[1] Rom. vi. 4. [2] Acts xix. 6. [2] John iii. 5.
[4] 1 Cor. i. 15. [5] 2 Cor. xii. 12.

prophecy, and performance of extraordinary acts. He calls them simply "wonders of an apostle," and in this respect, at least, holds himself no whit inferior to the chiefest of the apostles.

It follows clearly from the conclusion of our Gospel according to Mark and the Epistle of James, that the church, especially of Judæo-Christians, recognized its possession of this miraculous power to the end of the first century, and that apostles and elders anointed the sick with oil, prayed over the infirm, and exorcised demons from the possessed.

As for the question, who has the true faith, the Gospel of Mark makes Jesus give this answer on his departure: "In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover;" "for," says the Epistle of James, "the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much,"[1] especially, may it be said, when enthusiasm is met by enthusiasm, faith by faith.

Thus in every relation the primitive church offers the spectacle of a fellowship whose operation does not recognize itself as bound to the ordinary material conditions of life. It is the Spirit speaks, the Spirit prophesies, the Spirit aids in healing or working miracles. So it was not only the consciousness of a divine presence which had been found, but also its external attestation. So confident a sense, however, so ardent an enthusiasm, would brook no obstacle. The advance of the Galileans was a perpetual challenge to the opponents of Jesus; the stir aroused by their immigration, their mode of edification and their public methods, taking the form, as occasion offered, of popular exhortation, exorcism of the possessed, and the laying of hands on the sick, but everywhere making it the chief object to bring forward the "proof of the spirit and power" in support of Jesus' Messiahship, whether in the darkness of the sick-room, or working in the publicity of the market-place upon the persons

[1] James v. 16.

of notorious cripples. So the Galileans, too, take an active part in the movements which make up the history of their age, and from this time forward gain an assured position.

---

4. The Struggle over the Messiahship of Jesus.

To imagine the expansion of the Christian church as essentially due to an apostolate of rhetoric, an organized missionary body on well-considered plans of extension, would be wholly to misconceive the manner in which it took place. In reality, it came about much more simply. Intercourse with the man from the Lake of Gennesareth had struck a note in the life of this little band that rang ever wider abroad, and made every heart attuned to religion vibrate in sympathy. Jesus and Paul alike spoke of a mystery of love including all wisdom, a love of God higher than all reason, whereby the children of God have sight where the wise are blind, and the simple behold what is for ever hidden from the wise and prudent.[1]

The spirit of love, spoken of by Jesus, had a great effect upon the homely men who had come up from the verdant banks of the lake to the gloom of Jerusalem. This is shown by the whole tone, gracious and admirable to-day as centuries ago, which permeates the Gospel first given shape in this circle. The chords that stir to-day in every uncorrupt heart are the same that in those days drew men from the halls of the synagogue to the upper chambers of the Christians.

No doubt the disciples expressly took up missionary work among the people; "I believe, therefore I speak," was as true then as now; but the customs of the people and the culture of Galilean fishermen and peasants make it likely in itself that this appeal did not rest upon the power of rhetoric, but proceeded for the most part by prayer, ecstatic speech, brief testi-

[1] Rom. v. 5 and 8, viii. 35; 1 Cor. viii. 1, xiii. 13.

mony and, in certain cases, exorcism. "Silver and gold have I none, but such as I have give I thee. In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk." This epigrammatic answer of Peter to the lame man who sat daily in the gate of the temple called Beautiful, gives, in fact, a very truthful picture of the way in which believers proceeded, albeit the narrative itself, considering that it was not written till the following century, lacks historical attestation. Exorcism, the laying on of hands, and attempts at miraculous cures, most foreign to us, were precisely the means most commonly employed to prove the divine powers of Jesus.[1] That warm love of their Master's, strong as death, and in devotion as unalterable as hell, had descended upon the little church. The ardour which carried away the disciples, amid shouting and groaning and exultation, until they spoke with tongues and renounced their native land and rejected their goods, was the same ardour that made war upon demons, upon the traces of Satan in this world, and the misery of disease and weakness. Who will say to the fire of such enthusiasm: So far shalt thou burn; the rest is madness?

The existence of such feeling is subject to its own laws, and refuses to be measured by the rule of cold reasonableness. Accordingly, whatever inaccuracies there be in the individual accounts of miracles, the general outline of proceedings is practically the same in Paul's accounts and in the paraphrastic narrative presented by the Acts: "And by the hands of the apostles were many signs and wonders wrought among the people. And they were all with one accord in Solomon's Porch. And of the rest durst no man join himself to them; but the people magnified them. And believers were the more added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women, insomuch that they brought forth the sick into the streets and laid them on beds and couches, that at the least the shadow of Peter passing by might overshadow some of them. There came also a multi-

[1] Cf. in much later times the analogous examples in Justin i., Apol. 6; Iren. Hær. ii. 22; Orig. c. Cels. 8; Tertull. De Anima, 47.

tude out of the cities round about unto Jerusalem, bringing sick folk and them that were vexed with unclean spirits; and they healed every one."[1]

Such, indeed, we may conceive was the essential method in which Christianity spread. Belief kindled belief; actual successes amazed the multitude; the news spread from house to house, and was borne further on the wings of rumour; the gift of tongues spread contagiously from one family to another; the Spirit spoke by the lips of children and infants. But it was not in the least a doctrinaire process.

Our authorities, which in their present state of course belong to the second century, believed they could give a more detailed account of the intercourse between the leaders of the new religion and the people that followed them. Nevertheless, their accounts are little more than imaginary, yet significant and representative compositions.

In the first rank stand the portions of the Judæo-Christian Acts of Peter[2] preserved in the Clementine Recognitiones, and our canonical Acts of the Apostles. The first point in which the former shows itself far the less reliable, is that it makes seven years of active missionary work by the apostles precede the first persecution of the church.[3] In it the priests and lawyers of Jerusalem hold a disputation upon Jesus' Messiahship with the apostles in the temple itself. The twelve apostles ascend the temple steps with their followers; the high-priest enjoins silence on the people; and a formal debate on religion begins. The priests' objections are met by Matthew;[4] those of the Sadducees by Andrew. A Samaritan, who appears for Gerizim, is put to confusion by James and John; Philip confutes the lawyers out of the Scriptures; John's disciples are corrected by Barnabas and the supplementary apostle Matthias; while the

[1] Acts v. 12—16. Lucian, Philopseust. 16, also testifies to the frequent occurrence of such exorcisms among the Christians of the second century.

[2] For this book, cf. below, Hist. of the Judaistic Apostles.

[3] Clem. Recog. 43.

[4] Ib. 55, seq.

high-priest in person is forced to yield before the witness of Thomas. Victory rests with the apostles; and as they had before a powerful advocate in the Sanhedrin, viz. Gamaliel, the conversion of the whole people is imminent. The populace is on the point of imploring baptism, when "an enemy" comes forward and cries to the Jews: "What do ye, men of Israel? How can ye suffer yourselves to be so easily led away?" But when he too is worsted by the arguments of James, he loads the priests themselves with abuse, calls the people to violence, and the persecution begins.

The account in the Acts gives an impression of greater fidelity to original sources, so far as it can be brought into accord with the data furnished by Gal. i. 18 and ii. 1, viz. that the young church was visited by persecution within a year of Christ's death. At the same time it has incomparably more to tell of the short interval of peace. Further, the attitude of Jewish parties towards the Messianic preaching of the Galileans is most correctly shown in the Acts of the Apostles. The Pharisees contested the assertion that Jesus is the Christ; the Sadducees loudly protested against the gospel of approaching resurrection and judgment as the preaching of uproar and anarchy.[1]

Here, too, we find the disciples of Jesus early and late in the open spaces where once their Master had striven with the Pharisees; and the same servants of the temple who had seized Jesus in the Garden of Gethsemane now laid rude hands upon them.

This in itself is perfectly conceivable. The Sadducean aristocracy of the temple, sorely menaced by the ferment universal among the lower classes, and alarmed by the pressing fear of a great Messianic movement, could not and would not endure a recrudescence of the enthusiasm for the preaching of the kingdom which they had crushed in the case of Jesus. Gerizim might be dealt with by Pilate; as for the hall of Solomon, the sons of Annas felt strong enough to keep it free themselves from the like preaching. They, at all events, the dominant house of

[1] Acts iii. 1, v. 21, iv. 5, v. 17; Ant. xx. 9, 1.

Annas, dared to bear the reproach that Annas and Caiaphas had slain the Messiah. To them, the preaching of the kingdom come and the returning Christ could only be the standard of uproar and anarchy, and so it was that the sons of Annas availed themselves of the measures which the authority of office put within their power.[1]

By this time, however, the rising tide of Pharisaism had carried some important Pharisees up into the Sanhedrin. Both the Petrine authority and the Acts tell of Rabbi Gamaliel's mediation. Conformably with his proverbial gentleness, he had decided that the movement should be let alone, and then it would fall away of itself, like kindred Messianic upheavals, if it were not really the fulfilment of the promise set forth by God himself.

However certainly we may discern an anachronism of the writer's in Gamaliel's reference to the prophet Theudas, who is first mentioned by Josephus in the reign of Claudius,[2] it is equally certain that not all the Pharisees opposed the church of the kingdom, springing as it did from the same stock as themselves. Gamaliel, as the Acts tell us, only acted in 36 as according to Josephus, other Pharisees undoubtedly acted at the trial of James in 63.[3] Consequently, even if the story of the Acts is fictitious, it only makes Gamaliel apply his real principles to a special case. The actual position of the Pharisees led them to resist violent interference with the preaching of the kingdom, for such an attack might next day with equal justice be turned against their own hopes. Nevertheless, the apostles were not let go from the Sanhedrin without the favourite punishment of the synagogue, forty stripes save one.

Yet with regard to these earliest struggles of the church, we do not rest entirely upon historical compositions of a later and

[1] Ant. xx. 9, 1; Acts iv. 5, v. 17.

[2] Ant. xx. 5, 1. According to the Rabbis, Gamaliel first entered the Sanhedrin through Herod Agrippa; cf. above p. 81.

[3] Ant. x.:. 9, 1.

chronicle-making age. The arguments on either side in the debate between Galileans and their adversaries have become a part of the actual Gospels, so that we have direct sources here at our command.

The strongest national objection to the assertion that Jesus is the Christ, could almost be inferred without direct evidence. It was the ignominious death upon the cross. This was the chosen point of attack for hostile argument. The debate began on Golgotha itself. According to the Synoptics, the adversaries cried in the ear of the dying Messiah: "Physician, heal thyself." "If he be the king of Israel, let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him." "Let us see whether Elias will come to save him." "Thou that destroyest the temple and buildest it in three days, come down."

These taunts still told, for he that was crucified had not come down, nor had Elias come to help him. The disciples naturally replied that this death was of no account, since Jesus had risen again. We do not know what answer the adversaries made to this assertion. There was, however, a dispute over the reality of the resurrection, and all manner of assertions were circulated, as is shown by the story of the alleged watchers of the sepulchre, and the rumour set afoot by the Pharisees that the disciples had stolen away the corpse of Jesus.[1] In any case, the resurrection did not rank as a proof of Messiahship among those who denied the very fact.

But the faith of the Christians offered to prove from the Old Testament "that the Messiah must suffer thus according to the Scripture and enter into his glory." Their study of the Scriptures had convinced them that the prophets had foretold a suffering Messiah, rejected by the people, and condemned to an ignominious death. As a matter of fact, they could cite a hundred passages on their side, as applicable to the Messiah as most of those which had been so applied by the Rabbis; while the wide-spread opinion that whole sections of the canon "prophe-

[1] Matt. xxvii. 67, seq., xxviii. 11, seq.

sied solely of the days of the Messiah,"[1] gave welcome aid to such exegesis.

It may be asked specifically what was the nature of this proof from the Scriptures that, in the temple, Hebrews like Peter, Matthew and John, and in the synagogue, Hellenists like Barnabas, Philip, Stephen and others, expounded to Libertines, Cilicians and the rest of the Greek Jews. It may perhaps be suggested in reply, that the arguments adduced for Jesus' Messiahship by the writings of the early Christians had also come into use in the synagogues, so that the application of the Old Testament brings us once more into the midst of the arguments and counter-arguments on either side.

The chief bulwark of Jesus' supporters, the *point d'appui* of their position, was the prophecy of the servant of Jehovah in the second part of Isaiah, of which Paul declares expressly in 1 Cor. xv. 3, that it was also referred to Christ by the other apostles as well.[2] So clearly did it seem to refer to Christ, that it forms the very core of the proof, not only in the writings of the Palestinian school, the Gospel of Matthew and the Apocalypse, but also in the fourth Gospel, which belongs in tendency to the Alexandrian school, and the Epistles of Paul and his disciples.

In the actual text of the second Isaiah, the servant of Jehovah represents the people of Israel,[3] which was to be the chosen servant of the true God, and whose misfortune is not the punishment of *his own* sin—for then what punishment must not the heathen suffer?—but a vicarious suffering undergone by Israel for the other nations, or by the faithful part of the people on behalf of the unbelieving.

But as the servant's sickness and wounds, his death and burial, are mourned by the poet, as he deals in splendid phrase with the sinful world, the lofty thought of the vicarious suffering of God's people for the sins of all is so artistically involved in

[1] Vol. i. p. 19, seq. (Eng. trans.). [2] Cf. the ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον.
[3] Is. xli. 8, seq., xliv. 1, seq., xlv. 4, xlviii. 20.

the symbolism of the story, that it can be well understood how a later generation believed the reference was not to the *people Israel*, but to some *prophet*, perhaps the great Prophet of the future.

Certainly the right meaning, that the servant is the *people* chastised in exile, never disappeared entirely from the schools of the Rabbis.[1] The Greek Bible of the Hellenists, indeed, supported this right interpretation, by paraphrasing the title, "My servant, my elect," as "Jacob, my servant; Israel, my elect."[2] Yet it failed to notice the significance of the emphatic expression, "the servant of Jehovah," though referring so pointedly to the Messiah that it was familiar even to the Jewish school. This signification must indeed have been firmly rooted in the tradition, or else the advantage which the Christians derived from it would have determined the Rabbis to bring about its timely disappearance. Instead of this, the Targum Jonathan in its Chaldaic paraphrase of the prophets, refers the servant of Jehovah to the Messiah without the slightest ambiguity, save that the characters of suffering in the servant are toned down as far as possible. The astonishment of the heathen at the miserable state of the just man is converted by the writer into the painful expectation of the coming of the Messiah, and his vicarious suffering into mere intercession. But the disfigurement of his countenance is referred, not to the Messiah, but to the people who are gloomy with sorrow and misery.

If now it were once recognized that Isaiah lii. and liii. referred to the Messiah, the followers of Jesus would have a very easy position, considering the arbitrary way of applying the history of the servant's suffering. If these two chapters were Messianic, then it could not be gainsaid that Jesus had in the highest sense fulfilled the type of the Messiah as here foretold. He who had passed so quietly and without noise among the people, was indicated when Jehovah said of his elect, in whom his soul delighted: "He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in

[1] Orig. Contr. Cels. i. 55. [2] Is. xlii. 1; cf. xliv. 3.

the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench. He shall not fail nor be discouraged till he have set judgment in the earth, and the isles shall wait for his law."[1]

Or what reply should Candace's eunuch make when Philip showed him the Messiah who "is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth."[2] If the servant of God is the Messiah, then the prophet clearly foresaw the mournful progress of the Redeemer to Golgotha. "He was taken from prison and from judgment; and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living; for the transgression of my people was he stricken. And they made his grave with the wicked, and with the sinner in his death; because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth."

The Nazarenes could ask confidently, whether the words of the prophet suited better with the temporal idea of the Messiah which the people set before itself, or with the sorrowful type of him crucified, when it is said of the servant of Jehovah: "He hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him. He is despised and rejected of men: a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief; and we hid as it were our faces from him: he was despised and we esteemed him not. Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows; yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed."

If all this had been told of the Messiah by Isaiah, the greatest of the prophets, who could doubt that the Scripture taught a suffering and dying Messiah? Whom did these promises fit better than him of Nazareth? The whole fate of Jesus found a clear and simple basis in this word of God. The Jewish type of Messiah assumed the features of Jesus with increasing dis-

[1] Is. xlii. 1—4. [2] Is. liii. 7.

tinctness. His was the figure that seemed to rise up from the promises of the old covenant.

These the Rabbis sought to set aside, but bit by bit the Nazarenes pieced out the life and death of Jesus from passages of the Scriptures. A hundred promises of the Holy Book cried to them: "Had not Jesus to undergo all such suffering and enter into his glory?" They pored eagerly over the Scriptures, to search for traces of Jesus' type in the books of the Old Covenant. The Evangelist who makes Jesus say, "Search the Scriptures; they are they which testify of me,"[1] believed he had found a corresponding prophecy in the prophets for the minutest features of Jesus' life and suffering.

Pious Israelites, again, might reflect that the son of David could not possibly come from Galilee. Even Nathanael asks, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?"[2] In return, Matthew is satisfied that Isaiah (xi. 1) called the Messiah a Nazir, or branch, in which he sees an ambiguous allusion to the origin from Nazareth.[3] The Baptist had to precede Jesus to make ready his way, in fulfilment both of Isaiah's phrase of the voice crying in the wilderness, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight,"[4] and of Malachi's tidings that a messenger is sent before the great day of God, to prepare all things.[5]

Jesus' work was to lie in despised Galilee, by the Lake of Gennesareth, in narrow Capernaum, in the districts of Zebulon and Naphthali, because Isaiah had said: "Zebulon and Naphthali and the land by the sea, Galilee of the Gentiles, saw great light."[6] The gentle type of him as the humble, succouring, healing and merciful, is clearly shown by the prophets to all who will see. He recognized himself as this healing Saviour of the lowly and poor, the humble Prince of peace, when in accordance with Zech. ix. 9, he entered Jerusalem "lowly and riding

¹ John v. 39.
² John i. 47.
³ Matt. ii. 23.
⁴ Is. xl. 3, in Mark i. 3.
⁵ Mal. iii. 1, seq., in Matt. xi. 10.
⁶ Is. viii. 23, ix. 1, in Matt. iv. 14.

upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass." His preaching to the poor was found in Isaiah;[1] his custom of speaking to the people in parables was foretold in the Psalms.[2]

Relying on the Bible, the Galileans are ready to combat the protests of the teachers. Where, ask the Rabbis, is it written that the Messiah should be rejected of his people? In Psalm cxviii. 22, answer the Nazarenes: "The stone which the builders refused is become the head-stone of the corner;" while in a permissible trope the prophet Daniel figures the Messiah as "the stone that was cut out without hands."[3] The same, again, is said by Isaiah: "Who hath believed our preaching?"[4] And Habbakuk predicts that the people will not believe Jehovah's work.[5]

The adversaries pour scorn upon the lamentable end of the band of disciples; whereupon they who are contemned point to Zech. xiii. 7: "I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered." But he was not only deserted by the eleven, he was betrayed by the twelfth. This fatality, too, was predicted by the Scripture, for David long since knew the betrayer, who eats bread with the Messiah and lifts up his heel against him;[6] and the blood-money he was to receive was foretold to the last penny by Zechariah: "They weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver."[7] Even his hesitation and repentance are foretold in the words: "Cast it unto the potter; a goodly price that I was prised at of them."[8]

Jesus himself had referred them to other passages. On the cross he had given utterance to his sense of desolation in the opening words of the 22nd Psalm; so the whole Psalm appeared to have reference to him; the Messiah was prophesied of in the Psalmist's lament: "All they that see me, laugh me to scorn;

[1] Is. lxi. 1, in Luke iv. 18. [2] Ps. lxxviii. 2, in Matt. xiii. 35.

[3] Luke ii. 34; Acts iv. 11; Matt. xxi. 42; 1 Pet. ii. 7; Eph. ii. 20, 6; Rom. ix. 33.

[4] John xii. 38—40. [5] Acts xiii. 41. [6] Ps. xli. 9; John xiii. 18.

[7] Zech. xi. 13. [8] Matt. xxvi. 15, xxvii. 9, 10.

they shoot out the lip; they shake the head, saying, He trusted on the Lord that he would deliver him: let him deliver him, seeing that he delighted in him. . . . . For dogs have compassed me; the assembly of the wicked have inclosed me; they pierced my hands and my feet. I may tell all my bones; they look and stare upon me. They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture." Even so it happened on the Place of Skulls. The women saw with their own eyes how the Roman soldiery cast lots for the relics.[1] So, too, in the words of the 69th Psalm, they now heard complaint of the parched sufferer on the cross: "They gave me also gall for my meat; and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink. . . . . I am become a stranger unto my brethren, and an alien unto my mother's children."[2]

Thus his figure and the hour of suffering on Golgotha had passed through the mind of the prophets ages before. He is the paschal lamb of Moses, whose legs might not be broken by the soldiers.[3] The prophet Zechariah had already beheld the spear that was plunged into Jesus' side, for it was of him that the prophet said: "They shall look on him whom they pierced."[4]

The Jews stumbled at Jesus' death between two malefactors; whereupon the Nazarenes pointed to Isaiah liii. 9: "He made his grave with the wicked and with the sinner in his death."

But not only the death of Jesus, but also his resurrection, was clearly foretold both in the type of Jonah, who was hidden for three days in the belly of the whale,[5] and in the words of David, which certainly cannot refer to the king long since dead and turned to ashes: "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, nor suffer thy Holy One to see corruption."[6] Finally, this very time of delay assigned by Jesus before his return upon the clouds of

[1] John xix. 23, 24. [2] John xix. 29.
[3] John xix. 36, after Exodus xii. 46.
[4] Zech. xii. 10, in John xix. 37; Rev. i. 7. [5] Matt. xii. 40.
[6] Ps. xvi. 10, in Acts ii. 26—31, and xiii. 36.

heaven, was found by his followers to be already promised: "Sit thou at my right hand," so runs the 110th Psalm, "until I make thine enemies thy footstool."[1]

Thus from the day of his birth till his return to the Father, all was pre-ordained. An inevitable destiny, decreed centuries before by the unchangeable word of God, brought about the fulfilment of Jesus' fate. His suffering and death prove, instead of disproving, that he is the elect of God, the promised Christ, the anointed of Israel. So deeply penetrated, indeed, were the followers of the new faith by the cogency of this proof from the Scripture, that even Paul, once an opponent of this inference, was afterwards unable to conceive how his countrymen could read the Old Testament without arriving at the same conclusion: "Their minds were blinded," he complains;[2] "for until this day remaineth the same veil untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament. . . . . But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heart."

For it is only too clear that this proof from the Scriptures did *not* make a deep impression on the synagogues in general. Nor is it difficult to understand the slightness of the result produced by the appeal to Scripture. The question whether Jesus is the Messiah was not really a question of exegesis. He who did not accept it from Jesus' own words would not find proof in the Scripture. It would be exceptional to win by this means one who had not been convinced already by the miracles of healing which proceeded from Jesus. Believers were confirmed by these proofs; unbelievers, on the contrary, embittered.

Now this proof from Scripture was not the exegesis of schooled theologians, but exposition from the hours of edification among religious communities, which applied isolated phrases without a suspicion of the historical bearings of the text. Such exposition by the average man may display no little devout sentiment, but it generally is lacking in logical power. We must imagine men truly devout, but at the same time truly fishers, tax-gatherers,

[1] Acts ii. 33; Matt. xxii. 44; Heb. i. 13. [2] 2 Cor. iii. 14, seq.

servants of the temple, in order to understand how both sides were incapable of effecting a reconciliation by argument. The ultimate answer of Pharisees and Sadducees to the Scripture proofs of the new sect was accusation before the tribunal and scourging before the synagogue,[1] until the appearance of more sweeping tendencies in the church itself led to a definite rupture.

---

5. Persecution of the Hellenists.

All spiritual advance is, generally speaking, nothing but the product of division. Thus Christian dogma was enriched with a set of characteristics during the struggle over the proof from Scripture. Above all, the conception of Jesus' death as a vicarious suffering and sacrifice arose from the necessity of proving *from the Scripture* that Jesus is the Messiah. Moreover, the Acts allude, though by hints rather than directly, to an antagonism in the church itself—the antagonism between Hellenists and Hebrews, from which our historical view, though not the church, derives the further advance and development of Christ's church.

Several considerations, however, are opposed to the statement of the book itself. The prominence given to the activity of the Hellenists in the Acts is scarcely disinterested. These Hellenists form a connecting-link between the original apostles and Paul; and the writer of the Acts, who first makes Peter the apostle of the Gentiles, transfers to these Hellenists of Jerusalem the brunt of vindicating the mission to the Gentiles.

It may also be asked whether the writer is not guilty of an anachronism in referring to the primitive Hebrew church the circumstances of the Dispersion, in which the Hebrew-speaking Judæo-Christians always upheld the connection with the Jews, and the Hellenists the mission to the Gentiles. It must be con-

[1] Matt. x. 17; Acts iv. 19, v. 40.

ceded that his picture of the past was influenced to some extent by the analogies of his surroundings, On the other hand, he tells us nothing that we should not have necessarily presupposed as existent in the primitive church. The antagonism between Hebrew and Hellenist ran through the whole Jewish world, and could not be immediately extinguished in the Christian church. Now the Acts is content for its own part to mention this antagonism, and states, in the second place, that a struggle had broken out between the Hellenists of the church and those of the synagogue, a fact established beyond the reach of doubt by the personal testimony of the Cilician Paul.[1]

Far from ascribing to Hellenism the responsibility or honour of first shaking off the shackles of the law, the Acts rather softens the antithesis in the church between Hebrews and Hellenists by confining it to an administrative dispute. No more does it make the wider preaching of the Hellenists the cause of their persecution. Far from this, it declares it was false witness to say that Stephen spoke against the temple service and the Mosaic law; the rupture was caused by the wickedness of the Jews, not by Stephen's radicalism. The only reproach, therefore, to be made against this view is, that it conceals the depth of the antagonism between Hellenist and Hebrew.

There is, therefore, the less reason for regarding this mention of a Hellenist element in the church as made with an ulterior purpose. This element was present, and had in reality a far more important influence on the development of Christianity than is given it by the Acts. It was precisely in Jerusalem, the seat of the Hebraist school, that the Greek Bible was looked upon with growing disfavour, and the use of the Gentile language despised. On another occasion, too, the Acts shows unmistakably how sensitive on this point were the feelings of the people in Jerusalem. It tells how at the feast of Pentecost, 59, the fury of the multitude against Paul was in-

[1] Gal. i. 13, seq.; 1 Cor. xv. 9; 2 Cor. xii. 32.

stantly calmed when he began to speak in Hebrew, for they had thought they had to do with a Hellenist and breaker of the covenant.

This antagonism, however, was by no means limited to the language. We have seen before that the supporters of the Greek Bible from the beginning imagined a far wider horizon for the blessings and promises of Judaism than the Hebrews. They aimed at the salvation of the Gentiles through Mosaism, while the fanatical and self-centred Jews would rather have seen the salvation of the Holy Land from the Gentiles. Remote from the temple, the former had grown accustomed to look beyond the historical and accidental, and regard the eternal, humanistic precepts of the law as the essential.

Seeing, then, that the idea of preaching the risen Messiah to the Gentile world arises precisely among these Greek-speaking Jews,—seeing that the accusation against Stephen is that he was a Hellenist and aimed at *overthrowing the temple services*,—while, on the other hand, emissaries of the Hebraist Christians are everywhere at work in the churches of the Dispersion on behalf of the temple services, circumcision and the law,[1] and the Epistle to the Hebrews finds it necessary to warn these churches forcibly against setting too great value on the Jewish worship in the temple, blasphemy of which by a Hellenist like Stephen is m[et] by stoning,—seeing all this, it is perfectly clear that the anta[a]gonism which severed Hebrew and Greek Jews had passed with all its impulses into the church of Jesus.

It is the antithesis between Universalism and Particularism, between historical and reforming, national and cosmopolitan tendencies, that separated the two sections of the little church. This construction is not directly put upon the facts by the Acts; it only appears indirectly from the unmistakable data the book contains.

Among the Christians of Jerusalem mentioned by the Acts, whose names mark them as Hellenists, three are of chief import-

[1] 2 Cor. xi. 22.

ance: Stephen, Philip and Nicolas. There is no trace of STEPHEN in any earlier document. He is known to the church through the Acts. The statements, however, that until his appearance the disciples enjoyed the good-will of the people, while it was he against whom the rulers lifted up their hands—that he was stoned for blasphemy, while the twelve apostles remained undisturbed meantime in Jerusalem—leave the impression that Stephen must have taught and preached something which the twelve Galileans had not taught nor preached.

As for PHILIP, who also is first mentioned in the Acts as one of the seven deacons,[1] he leaves theory for practice. He preaches the gospel in Samaria, falls in with Simon Magus and Candace's eunuch, and works on the coast of Phœnicia, finally settling there in Cæsarea. In a word, he is one of the fathers of the mission to the Gentiles.

Finally, the last-mentioned among the ministers of the poor in Jerusalem is NICOLAS, with the remark that he was a proselyte of Antioch.[2] The fathers of the church agree in making him the founder of the Nicolaitanes, mentioned in Rev. ii. 6.[3]

After the particular way in which the Nicolas of the Acts is mentioned at the end, in contrast as it were to Stephen, who is mentioned at the beginning as the man full of faith and the Holy Ghost, it is not improbable that he is meant to be identified with the Nicolas or Balaam of the Apocalypse (ii. 6, 14). Now the strong Judæo-Christian John says of these Nicolaitanes that they eat things sacrificed to idols and permit themselves Gentile immorality. They belong, therefore, to the radical Gentile-Christianity, that cared neither for the Jewish law nor the ordinances concerning proselytes. The fact that Antioch was the centre at which these quarrels originated makes the identi-

[1] Acts vi. 5.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Iren. Hær. i. 26; Hippolyt. Ref. omn. Hær., ed. Duncker and Schneidewin, Götting. 1859, p. 408; Tertull. De Præscr. ch. xlvi.; Clem. Alex. Strom. ii. 20, 490, ii. 4, 522.

fication of the Nicolas of Revelation with the Nicolas of the Acts still more probable, as the latter is expressly noted as a Gentile Christian from Antioch.

These notable Hellenists, then, are all three forerunners of the apostle Paul's preaching of freedom from the law. Now whatever deductions must be made from the narrative as far as concerns their activity, Philip's settlement at Cæsarea and Nicolas' antinomian position are supported by irrefragable testimony.[1] Whoever, then, does not hold the raising of scruples to be the proper task of scientific theology, must recognize that this element of freedom, the presence of which is intended to be shown by the partly legendary narratives of the Acts, did actually make its appearance in the primitive church.

In the first days of enthusiasm, indeed, joy in the general recognition of the Messiah of Nazareth so filled the foreground that various sources of discord were overlooked in it. But their struggle with the Jews which soon began over Jesus' Messiahship could not fail by degrees to bring to light the divergence of their own views. Strange to say, it was now the Hellenists of the city who fell out with one another far more violently than the Hebrews. Considering all the points of difference on either side, it is easy to imagine a doctrinal dispute between Hebrews and Hellenists, alike within and without the church. It is quite another question why the struggle of the Hellenist followers of Jesus first broke out against Hellenists.[2] The answer can only lie in the fact that the true Oriental is averse to disputation in itself and little skilled in long discussions. He bears witness of his faith in prophetic speech, and commends the unconvinced to God, or consigns him to perdition. It was otherwise with the Græcised Jew, to whom Josephus' comment on the Greeks might apply: "For disputation their mouth is ever open and their tongue loosed."[3] The quarrelsome and contentious element within and without the church consisted of the Hellenists. Thus

[1] Acts xxi. 8, the "we" document; Rev. ii. 6.

[2] Acts vi. 9 and ix. 29.

[3] Bell. Procem. 5.

it may well be a correct reminiscence of fact to make the breach among Jesus' disciples occur not between Hebrews, but between members of the Greek synagogues which had adopted the belief in Jesus, and plunged into a dispute with "those who belonged to the synagogue of the Libertines and Cyrenians and Alexandrians, and them of Cilicia and of Asia."[1]

The participation of Paul the Cilician in these disputations is indeed sufficient proof of the correctness of the statement.[2] Now in itself it is certainly true that the Hebrews used to be far more fanatical in word and deed than the Hellenists, who had become more tolerant through intercourse with the Gentiles. Their wider horizon made a narrow zeal for religion impossible. But this was not entirely true of all Hellenists; the chief exceptions were those who had settled in Jerusalem.

Now these would be for the most part the very men who had been impelled to the Hebrew capital by a pious desire to enter the Holy Land and the city of David, the dwelling-place of the Lord. They may even have been in part religious zealots, dissatisfied from the first with their Gentile surroundings in a foreign land, and hoping to find in the Holy City the satisfaction of their religious needs, never satisfied in the Gentile world. In any case, a more lively personal interest in religion must be presupposed amongst them than among the Hebrews, who had grown torpid in the lifeless service of the law.

To them, moreover, the tidings of the coming of the Messiah could not possibly be indifferent. Either they accepted it in thankful faith, like the seven whose names are furnished us in the Acts, or, like Paul of Tarsus, they attacked it indignantly as the falsification of Israel's most sacred assurances.

Thus the first great struggle over Jesus was a struggle in the Greek colony of Jerusalem. Of the four hundred and eighty synagogues in the city, three belonged to the Dispersion—one to the Roman, Cyrenian and Alexandrian Jews, one to the Cilicians, the third to the Jews of proconsular Asia.

[1] Acts vi. 9.

[2] Gal. i. 13, 14.

It was in these synagogues of the Hellenists that Stephen, speaking upon the portion of Scripture appointed for the Sabbath, declared that the Messiah had appeared and had been rejected of his people. Consequently, it is equally clear that new Greek converts such as these must have had a furious quarrel with the strictly limited and isolated circle of their Greek-speaking countrymen to which they had till then belonged, and that on their side the contest was carried on with a far more powerful artillery of argument than on the part of their adversaries.

It is only consonant with the first principles of Hellenistic culture that the universalist tendency of Christianity now asserts itself, and Jesus' idea, so momentous in its consequences, proceeds to include the world instead of a mere theocracy in the kingdom of the Messiah. At least the adversaries professed to understand from Stephen's speech that, in his view, temple and priesthood were abrogated. Not only Sadducees, who hated the actual preaching of the kingdom, but even also Pharisees now accuse Stephen of blasphemy in contemplating the abolition of the temple and Jewish customs through Jesus of Nazareth.[1] Here, of course, as in the trial of Jesus, the writer of the Acts explains these assertions as mere calumnies. But even the disciples of Jesus must have taken their ground on the firm belief that the Messiah would bring a new temple. "Yet a little while," ran the prophecy of Haggai, "and I will shake all nations and will fill this house with glory. The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former, saith the Lord of Hosts, and in this place will I give peace."[2] Arguing from this passage, later Scriptures had been much occupied with the Messianic rebuilding of the temple,[3] and therefore it could hardly have been mere calumny to accuse Stephen of actually suggesting the abolition of worship in the temple.

But how much more closely this prophecy referred to the reconstruction of Jewish existence, begun by Jesus and to be completed by him at his second advent. It needed no more,

[1] Acts vi. 9. [2] Cf. Hag. ii. 3—9. [3] Enoch ix. 13; Sib. iii. 290.

e

however, to make the Pharisees raise their cry of alarm: "This man ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place and the law."

It was Jonathan, son of Annas, appointed by Vitellius as Caiaphas' successor, who took cognizance of this accusation, and by arbitrary process of law condemned Stephen to be stoned, according to the penalty appointed for blasphemy in Leviticus xxiv. 10.[1] The power of life and death belonged to the procurator and not to the Sanhedrin; but Vitellius had deposed Pilate and not yet formally appointed his successor, while Pilate did not reach Rome till after the death of Tiberius. The aristocracy, too, had held their head high since the proconsul, hard pressed by Parthians and Arabs, had been so indulgent to the Jews at the Passover of 36. Thus this high-handed proceeding may be regarded as an attempt of the Sanhedrin to arrogate further privileges to itself. At all events, on his next visit at the Passover of 37, the proconsul found himself provoked once more to remove the newly elevated high-priest, a step not improbably consequent on the usurpations of authority mentioned above. It may, too, be partly a result of the period of excitement that Jerusalem hereafter directs its fanaticism against the followers of the prophet who corresponded least to their secular ideal.

The stoning of Stephen outside the walls of the Holy City marked the commencement of the persecution which now spread rapidly from the capital over the country. As to its extent, we have the personal account of one who was directly concerned in it—Paul, who writes to the Galatians: "Ye have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jew's religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the church of God, and wasted it; and profited in the Jew's religion above many my equals in mine own nation, being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of

[1] For the chronology, cf. Ant. xviii. 4, 34, with 2 Cor. xi. 32, according to which Aretas, who attacked Damascus after the deposition of Caiaphas, was already established there. If Jesus and Stephen had been condemned by the same high-priest, the fact would probably have been preserved by tradition.

my fathers."[1] These words do but find a wider interpretation when in the Acts Paul is made to say: "Many of the saints did I shut up in prison, having received authority from the chief-priests; and when they were put to death, I gave my voice against them. And I punished them oft in every synagogue, and compelled them to blaspheme; and being exceedingly mad against them, I persecuted them even unto strange cities."[2] According to another account, he had let his fury fall even upon the women of the church,[3] and had not only broken into synagogues, but into houses, in pursuit of Christians.

The consequence was the destruction of the band who had experienced the revival of the first Pentecost. The places of assembly were deserted; the upper chambers stood empty; the speaking with tongues was silenced. The fugitives went north to Samaria, to Galilee, at last even to Damascus, where the parent church of Capernaum may have planted offshoots already. But even there the Sanhedrin found means to assail them, with the help of fanatical agents and a willing ethnarch, set over the city by the Arab Aretas.

The persecution reached its limit by the Passover of 37 at latest. Vitellius made his second appearance in Jerusalem as a victorious general, and withal an incorruptible judge. Jonathan, son of Annas, was deprived of the honour he had so lately attained. Theophilus, another son of Annas, was installed in his place.[4] The church was able to re-assemble in peace during the days of Caligula. The Acts, indeed, state that even during the persecution the twelve apostles had not quitted the spot where they were to await the return of Jesus.[5] Certain it is that in the year 39 Paul found them in Jerusalem on his return from Damascus, and passed fifteen days with Cephas. Further, Paul not only knows that the twelve apostles are in Jerusalem three years later, but assumes their presence there immediately after his conversion in saying: "I conferred not with flesh and

[1] Gal. i. 13, seq. [2] Acts xxvi. 10, seq. [3] Acts xxii. 4, viii. 3.
[4] Ant. xviii. 5, 3. [5] Acts viii. 1.

blood, neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me."[1]

Immediately after his conversion, therefore, he was aware that those whom he sought in Damascus had remained in Jerusalem, or else, as has also been inferred, the persecution did not extend to the Hebrew Christians, because the twelve Hebrews had no reason for leaving Jerusalem.[2]

At all events, the persecution must have raged more furiously against the Hellenists, who were hated to begin with, than against the Hebrews, who had not transgressed the rule of what was permitted by the theocracy. This has further given rise to the supposition that from this point dates a severance between the two parties in the church; for the Hellenists, whose far-reaching propositions had brought the church into such disaster, now held aloof from the Holy City, to labour for their views the more zealously among the Dispersion.

Naturally we feel that Hellenism can have met with little support in Jerusalem in the succeeding decades. The fanaticism of the native Jews, which had risen since the struggle with the Greeks, made the sojourn of their Græcising co-religionists insupportable, while the great movement during the reign of Caligula brought the Hebrew Christians an earlier alleviation of their condition.

For with Caligula, people and priesthood alike underwent greater trouble than the Galilean belief in the Messiah, the final judgment on which might be left, as Gamaliel advised, to time. The church's connection with the people, its sense of being closely bound up with the fate of Israel, grows visibly stronger once more. The Christians, too, felt their pulse quicken when they heard of the attacks made by the Gentile Cæsar upon the sanctuary. The figure of the sacrilegious prince made a deep impression on Christendom, as witness the Apocalypse and the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians. As the church had regarded war and the rumour of war as heralding the approach

[1] Gal. i. 16. [2] Gal. i. 17.

of the Messiah, so they shared the belief of the Jews that the prince spoken of in Daniel and the adversaries of the Messiah had risen up in Caius to profane the temple—the stronger proof that the Saviour, the Messiah, was not far away.

It is clear from the absolutely uniform effect of the same event upon the synagogue and the Christian community, that the two are as yet far from being really separate; but a union had again taken place with the theocratic church so far as the belief in Jesus allowed. Yet as the tide of national feeling carried all before it in the days of Caligula, it was but natural that the law of reaction should assert itself in a corresponding ebb.

---

6. The Primitive Church during the Pharisaic Restoration.

The religious victory over Rome had been a victory for Pharisaism. With the accession of Agrippa, the kingdom of David was re-established, and the new king bowed his knee to Jehovah. Jerusalem itself became the scene of a model piety, in which Agrippa and good queen Cypros outdid, if possible, the priests and Rabbis.

Now as certainly as Jesus' disciples underwent sanguinary oppression beneath the retrograde movement of the theocratic polity, they themselves were unable to withstand the tendency of the time. The position of the apostles in 54 is not what it was in 35. The fact is attested by the loud complaints of the apostle Paul, though even without his express testimony it could be inferred from the documents alone. Borne along by the movements in Palestine, they had shared with the people the experiences of Caligula's reign, and with them they now came under the subsequent reactionary tendency.

But however much the Christians of this period had fallen from the original strictness of their principles, they still troubled the supremacy of the theocratic parties, who were nettled by

the presence of a party founded by one who had spoken such crushing words of Pharisaism; while these sayings passed from lip to lip, or even, maybe, circulated in written form already, sayings that have turned the honourable name of "Pharisee" into a byword for all time.

On various occasions during Agrippa's government, the Gentiles of the Jewish cities and the Samaritans were to learn what it meant for the Pharisees to wield the executive power. The risings of the oppressed Samaritans in the year 44 are a sufficiently clear protest against the nature of Pharisee administration, albeit Josephus is unwilling to recognize the reason of the evil odour in which the flower of all Jewish kings was held in Samaria. For Agrippa, therefore, to seize upon and vex certain of the church, as is told in the Acts, and so to revive the persecution of the Christians, which had ceased for nearly seven years, was no isolated outburst of ill-humour on his part, but the outcome of his system, fraught with important consequences. The costliest sacrifice to be offered to Jewish hatred was James, the son of Zebedee, who, perhaps, with a vehemence of a "Son of Thunder," had been too bold in stirring up the people, and was killed by Agrippa with the sword. Thus he who had asked to sit at the right hand of Jesus in the kingdom was the first to enter it.

When the brothers uttered their request, Jesus (according to the historical documents) asked them: "Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" Undoubtedly the writer of the documents on which our history rests, had the fulfilment of this expression in mind when he incorporated it into his narrative. It is noticeable, too, how the Apocalypse has special thought for those who were beheaded for the witness of Jesus and for the word of God. "They lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." An earlier passage says menacingly: "If any man have an ear, let him hear. He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity: he that killeth with the sword must be killed

with the sword."[1] Judging from this manner of death, the execution of James must have been the Pharisee king's own and proper act, as according to Jewish law the Sanhedrin would rather have decided upon stoning.

But now the wild beast in the Pharisee had tasted blood, and demanded new victims. Agrippa's motives are appraised at their true worth by the Acts: "Because he saw it pleased the Jews, he proceeded further to take Peter also." He intended to deliver the leader of the sect to the people, after the feast of the Passover in 44; whereupon a universal persecution of the Christians would undoubtedly have taken place. But Peter was saved by a good angel, and his gaolers were executed instead. Or was it Agrippa's angel of death that intervened, for the king died that very spring?[2]

Under these circumstances, the church could not share in the general mourning for the popular prince. The Christians in Cæsarea, Philip and his daughters the prophetesses, were hardly amongst the men and women who thronged round the palace praying in sackcloth and ashes for the precious life to be spared. On the contrary, the Christians not only rejoiced over his sudden death, which plunged Israel into mourning, but depicted it as the visible punishment of God, transferring to Agrippa the story told of Herod the Bloody by Josephus, and of Antiochus Epiphanes by the second Book of Maccabees:[3] "The angel of the Lord smote him; and he was eaten of worms and gave up the ghost."[4]

Still this period of religious reaction did not pass without leaving its mark on the church, which paid its own tribute to the age of Agrippa in more pronounced legalism and greater shrinking from contact with the Gentiles. Their own security now demanded that they should avoid giving the slightest offence to the people, with their intense zeal for the law. If those in

[1] Rev. xx. 4 and xiii. 10.
[2] Acts xii. 23; Ant. xix. 8, 2; Dio Cass. lx. 22, 23.
[3] 2 Macc. ix. 5.
[4] Acts xii. 23.

Jerusalem enforced a rigid observance of the law abroad as well as in the city, their reason was, as Paul knew well, "lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ."[1]

For a new era had begun with the middle of the year 40. The rule of Agrippa had not lasted long, yet had been fraught with most important consequences for Judæa. It was not merely that the king had helped Pharisaism to power during his lifetime; the influence of the party continued to grow when Claudius now once more re-established the office of procurator. For a fanatical tendency is by nature never stronger than when it is suppressed and its aims imperilled. Now, as the rule of Claudius first helped fanaticism into power and then suddenly inclined again to a Gentile administration, there ensued a rupture of every relation in the province. But unfortunate circumstances followed, to the further embitterment of the people. A new patriotic resistance arose, surpassing all that had ever been known of the Jews. The supremacy of the Pharisees, established by Agrippa, now for the first time became exclusive, and the renewed strife against Rome let loose a fanaticism which immediately produced a frenzy of prophecy and broke out in ever new commotions. They were unmistakably hurrying into war, and so we see the whole nation gather with growing zeal round the temple and the banner of Pharisaism.

A number of phenomena, however, indicate that the Christians of Palestine for the most part were also affected by this tendency towards the law, and the maintenance of national existence, together with this patriotic and religious spirit. There is good reason for the Pauline Epistles to repeat so indefatigably that the Christians' kingdom is in heaven, whence they look for the Saviour to come; and that in contrast to the enslaved earthly Jerusalem there is a free Jerusalem in heaven above, "which is the mother of us all."[2]

The retrogression to Jewish ordinances which then took place would doubtless have been impossible for the Christian church

[1] Gal. vi. 12. [2] Gal. iv. 26.

had it clearly conceived that the kingdom of Christ only consists in a Christ-like condition of the heart. It had not yet dawned, however, on the first Christians that the kingdom should be an inward growth from the seed planted in the heart, and not an outward circumstance of theocracy. The thought first appears clearly in Paul, and is consecutively developed in the fourth Gospel. But among the first Nazarenes the thought of the kingdom of God continually took the form of the coming Messianic age. Looking for Jesus as the coming Messiah, they knew not that the kingdom was already present, without need of further revelation from heaven. The sense of sonship given them by Jesus still seemed but a foretaste, an earnest, of the glory to come. Their inward life of religious morality is not an end in itself; it is not the kingdom, but the *pre-condition* of the kingdom.

Now so long as promise and fulfilment remained thus severed, the question might well be raised, What was the attitude of this time of transition in respect of obedience to the theocracy and the Jewish law? This law had no more significance for Paul and his school, who saw the kingdom in the new birth of the inward man. On the other hand, the Palestinian church, with firmer expectation of an outward realization of their Messianic hopes, were proportionately interested in continuing their accustomed mode of life till the advent of the new order in Jerusalem. Not feeling the primary necessity of breaking with the law, they were but too clearly subject to the ebb and flow of the spirit of the time as regards life in accordance with the law. In any case, the little church would have found it difficult in this time of patriotic excitement to maintain the independent position claimed by Jesus for himself. At a time when the highest interests of his country were at stake, how hard for a patriot to cry: "My kingdom is not of this world"! Thus we see Jesus' disciples descend from the ideal height of the conception of the kingdom, and take part with their nation against the Gentile oppressor.

The clearest view of this movement is gained by considering its starting-point and its conclusion. At the outbreak of the Jewish war we find the sympathies of the church openly on the opposite side, as at the death of Jesus. Jesus had doubted of Judaism and relied on those outside the law, like the prodigal son, who should find his way back to his father's house.[1] For the national question, he had only offered the cold words; "Wheresoever the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together;"[2] and, "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's."[3] In his eyes, the leaders of the patriotic party were blind leaders of the blind, serpents and a generation of vipers.[4] The fact that for this he had been hanged on the cross by the Pharisees amid the applause of the whole nation assembled for the feast of the Passover, could not but embitter the feeling of his followers against the national party.

Now, too, the Jewish people, and above all its dominant parties, had taken upon themselves the blood of Jesus which the Romans were unwilling to shed. While Pilate tried to save the Holy One of Israel, Pharisees and Sadducees preferred the murderer Barabbas to the Messiah. The mere fact of Roman soldiers having carried out the executioner's work, could not transfer the responsibility from the Pharisees to Pilate. The Gospels regard the Roman procurator in a comparatively gentle light; but for Philo and Josephus, we should not know this mild-spoken judge for a cruel oppressor of Israel.

It is very different in the fifties, when the struggle between Paul and the men of Jerusalem for the first time brings the local relations of the church into clearer light. By this time the city seems to have forgotten how Jesus once sat down to meat with publicans and sinners; how he neither fasted nor washed his hands before meat; for Peter is no longer suffered to sit at table with the uncircumcised. To go on somewhat later

[1] Matt. viii. 10, seq.; Luke xv. 11, seq.
[2] Matt. xxiv. 28.
[3] Matt. xxii. 21.
[4] Matt. xv. 14, xxiii. 33.

to the Jewish war, the Apocalypse makes Rome the Babylonian harlot, and Jerusalem the beloved city. As for the temple, of which Jesus prophesied that one stone should not be left upon another, John preserves it by the magic touch of his builder's staff, while over Rome he pours out seven and yet seven plagues. The capital of the world is stripped, is laid waste and desolate; Jerusalem is rebuilt in pearls and precious stones.

Just as here the champions of the idea of the kingdom once more take their stand upon the antagonism of nationalities, as it were translating Jesus' conception of the kingdom into Jewish ideas, so the church turned to closer observance of the law. If Peter's relations with the Gentiles, as represented in the Acts, did not bear other marks of intentional manipulation, it would be far from improbable in itself that the intercourse of the disciples even with Gentiles and Samaritans was much freer in the period immediately following the death of Jesus than after the two persecutions by Paul and Herod Agrippa. Peter, too, in Antioch is distinctly progressive in adjusting himself to the demands of Christian principle with all his old breadth of feeling; but by this time the headship of the church has been taken by another, who inclines the victory to the strict views of the law-abiding Hebrews. For the most prominent place in the differences with the foreign Hellenistic churches touching the duty of admitting none but the circumcised, was occupied by one who is emphatically the representative of the church's newly fired zeal for the law—JAMES, THE BROTHER OF THE LORD, surnamed the JUST.

He was the eldest of those brothers of Jesus who made their home in Jerusalem after the Passover of the year 35. As early as 39, when Paul comes to Jerusalem in order to become acquainted with Peter, James appears as the representative of a second body of authority, the Holy Family. After the new convert of Tarsus had seen Peter, he found a further interview with James necessary. When we meet with James fourteen years later, he appears to be recognized as the first authority in

the church of Jerusalem, and is specially named *before* Peter and *before* John.[1] Nor is this merely an honorary precedence; it marks a personal superiority to Peter and the rest; so much so that on one occasion during his stay at Antioch, Peter alters his mode of life once more into conformity with the law when "certain came from James."[2]

It follows also from this fact that the church of Jerusalem had gone back from the earlier and freer position to the ordinances of the law. The chief guardian of this fidelity to the law was James, who may well have been called the JUST in the Old Testament sense. Josephus tells us that when he died, the Pharisees were amongst the mourners.[3] He must therefore have actually assumed the position ascribed to him in Acts xxi., where, surrounded by men, all of them zealous for the law, he superintends the fulfilment of Nazirite vows, and shows how those who have taken them are to be absolved from their obligations.[4]

Again, the brother of Jesus cannot have been insignificant, for Josephus mentions him as a man of weight in his Jewish history; and the Pharisees, best known for their scrupulous accuracy in fulfilling the law, were so transported with anger at his stoning that they went out to meet the procurator Albinus on his way from Alexandria, to demand vengeance on the Sadducees for this judicial murder.[5] So, too, the appeal made everywhere by the strong Jewish party in the Christian church to brothers of Jesus, urging them to insist upon circumcision of Gentile brethren and strict observance of the Jewish laws about meats and the mode of life,[6] is well founded according to this historical testimony.

In itself, indeed, it is not improbable that James led a life of abnegation, for he is remembered in the Acts as a promoter of Nazirite vows, and mentioned by Hegesippus as himself a

[1] Gal. ii. 9.
[2] Gal. ii. 12.
[3] Ant. xx. 9, 1.
[4] Acts xxi. 20—24.
[5] Ant. xx. 9, 1.
[6] 1 Cor. ix. 5.

Nazirite, whose death was mourned by the Rechabites; while his surname Oblias, further, designates him as such.[2]

A later generation, indeed, sought either to soften down this situation, as the author of the Acts would prefer to veil the deep-rooted antagonism between James and Paul, or else turned it strongly to Judaistic party interests. While it is clearly established by 1 Cor. ix. 5, that some at least of the brothers of Jesus were married and accompanied on their journeys by their wives, the Judæo-Christian Hegesippus, in the following century, converts the eldest brother of Jesus into an Essene saint, for whom there could have been no standing-ground in the living church of the Christians. "He was a saint," he says of James, "from his mother's womb. He drank no wine nor any other fermented drink, nor did he eat of any animal food. His head was never touched by a razor. He neither anointed himself with oil nor bathed." Nay more: while, according to the testimony of Josephus, it was precisely the nobility of the temple who had James stoned, Hegesippus assures us: "He alone was permitted to enter the sanctuary, for he wore no wool, but a linen garment. He went alone into the temple, where he knelt continually, beseeching God for the forgiveness of the people, until the skin of his knees grew thick like that of a camel."[1]

As to this ideal portrait of the Essene, it is always noteworthy, historically, that what the fanatical Jewish Christians honoured in James was their own ideal. This signifies, of course, that he, to an even greater degree than Peter, was an extreme supporter of fidelity to the law, which was altogether reconcilable with the Christian view. This pre-eminence of his ranked, indeed, so high among the Essene Christians of the following century, that they placed the two brothers, Jesus and James, on an equality. The former is the staff "Beauty," the latter the staff "Bands," spoken of by the prophet Zechariah.[2]

[1] In Euseb. H.E. 2, 23.

[2] The correct derivation of the name Ὠβλίας, given to James by Hegesippus (Euseb. 2, 23), is from חוֹבְלְיָה, "My chain Jehovah," a surname

It was, of course, only after James' martyrdom that Zech. xi. 4, seq., was referred to him, and the name of Oblias given; but the mere fact dimly gives a remarkable picture of the light in which the church of Jewish Christians regarded the two great teachers and brothers. The persecuted little church appeared as "the flock of slaughter," ruthlessly slain by their purchasers. But Jehovah tended the flock with two staves. The one, Jesus, he called "Beauty;" the other, James, he called "Bands." First the staff Beauty is broken, and with it the covenant made with all the people, and only "the poor of the flock knew that it was the word of the Lord." But the prophet receives thirty shekels for the staff "Beauty," as prophetic of him who should one day sell "Beauty" to men for so many pieces of silver; and he casts them into the treasury of the temple, even as Judas did.

Moreover, the second staff, "Bands," the shepherd, bound as a Nazirite to Jehovah, was destined to be broken. The flock passes for a time into the hands of a foolish shepherd, till the coming of the day of Jehovah, which brings in the kingdom. While Jesus and James were regarded as the two staves with which God tended the church, this congregation had lost sight of the difference between James and Jesus maintained by Christianity elsewhere. Even if this excessive manner of speech did not begin till after

doubtless given to James on account of his being a Nazirite (as אָסַר, "to bind," is commonly used of vows, Numb. xxx. 3, seq., 10). Hegesippus indeed adds that James was surnamed Oblias, *διὰ ὑπερβολὴν τῆς δικαιοσύνης*; and with the same feeling the Jewish Christians surnamed him *δίκαιος*, and the Pharisees assumed an interest in him. Now if this "Oblias" refers to the bond of the Nazir, then Hegesippus' addition, *ὡς οἱ προφῆται δηλοῦσι*, usually considered a vague reference to Isaiah iii. 10, is much more closely connected with Zech. xi. 7, 10, 14, a chapter to which the Christians gave withal a Messianic significance, according to Matt. xxvi. 15, xxvii. 3. Indeed, they saw James foretold in the staff, חוֹבְלִים, as they referred the staff, נֹעַם, i. e. *χάρις*, to Jesus. But חוֹבְלִים means "embracing, inclusion," as well as *obstrictio*, "obligation," with regard to God. This was the meaning in which Hegesippius referred the prophetic passage to James when he further explained the name 'Ωβλίας as *περιοχὴ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ δικαιοσύνη ὡς οἱ προφῆται δηλοῦσι*. Cf. Hitzig, Minor Prophets, 3rd ed., p. 375.

the stoning of James, we see what good right Paul had to speak of "over-great apostles," to whom the church was blindly devoted. In any case, the brother of Jesus was one of those clear-cut personalities, whose self-confidence begets confidence in others, whose firmness exercised the influence which decision always has over those who do not know what they will, or do not will what they know. It was as a leader of this kind that Paul characterized "the Just," when he ranked him among the first of those who were accounted as the pillars of Christianity.[1]

The indisputable fact of such a personality coming to the head of the church in Jerusalem, and exercising a greater influence than even Peter, is a clear sign that Christianity in Palestine had come to live in perfect conformity with the law. As the leader enjoyed the good-will of the Pharisees, so also the church. It is a community strictly observing the law, and expecting the Messiah; and on the occasion of Paul's visit to the city in 59, James is represented in the Acts as saying: "Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous of the law."[2]

Whoever doubts this state of affairs, should compare the words of the Lord in the Synoptics with the expressions of the Apocalypse, the writer of which was certainly in intimate connection with the church in Palestine. Jesus said: "The field is the world, and all nations of the earth shall dwell under the tree of the kingdom of heaven." The Apocalypse assumes a very different attitude towards the Gentile world when it says: "Without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters,"[3] and refuses them salvation. "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still."[4] Jesus said to the disciples: "Eat what is set before you;" John calls it the doctrine of Balaam to teach the children of Israel to eat things sacrificed to idols.[5] Jesus said:

[1] Gal. ii. 9. Peter also comes last in 1 Cor. ix. 5.
[2] Acts xxi. 20.
[3] Rev. xxii. 15.
[4] Rev. xxii. 11.
[5] Rev. ii. 14.

"From the beginning of the creation God made them male and female. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife;"[1] but in the heaven of the Apocalypse those who have not defiled themselves with women and have remained unmarried are the following of the Lamb, and sing a song that no other man can learn.[2] Jesus said: "Many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven; but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."[3] In the Apocalypse, however, those who are sealed of the twelve tribes enter first into the kingdom of heaven. Gentile believers may not come till after these have entered, and then unsealed and unnumbered. They are citizens only by the protection of Israel, and of inferior rank in the following of the Lamb.[4]

Now practice went hand-in-hand with this theory. Up to the Jewish war we find the early Christians in the closest connection with the temple. It was while visiting the temple that James was slain. Peter, too, and John, hardly escaped from prison, straightway, according to the Acts, bend their steps again to the temple.[5] The disciples, facing towards the Holy of Holies, pray at the third, sixth and ninth hours, "when men used to pray;" and if they are in Jerusalem, the hour of prayer always finds them in the forecourt of Israel.[6] The prophets at Antioch serve the Lord with fasting; and thus prepared, after the manner of the Essenes, they hear the voice of the Spirit.[7] The foreign brethren come up to Jerusalem for the feasts;[8] they let their hair grow as an offering to the Lord,[9] and circumcise not only their children, but also the proselytes whom they have

[1] Mark x. 6, 7.
[2] Rev. xiv. 3—5.
[3] Matt. viii. 11, 12.
[4] Rev. vii. 9; cf. vii. 4 and xiv. 3.
[5] Acts iii. 11, ii. 46, v. 20, 42.
[6] Acts iii. 1, ii. 15, x. 9.
[7] Acts x. 30, xiii. 2.
[8] Acts xviii. 22, xx. 16.
[9] Acts xix. 2, xxi. 23. What is said of Paul must have happened to others.

brought into the covenant.[1] Their conscience, too, forbids them to sit at table with Gentiles,[2] a proof that the laws concerning meats were again in force with all their burdens. They keep the fast-days every week, and celebrate the new moon with the customary sacrifice of welcome. The high days of ancient custom, and even the sabbatical year with its peculiar forms, are binding on them as on every other Jew.[3]

In the face of this, no one will be ready to deny that the church had obviously sunk far below the lofty point of view which Jesus had taken up above antinomies and above his century. In this he was the master, they the disciples; moreover, the nationalist tendencies had grown stronger. Considering the political upheaval, which began with Caligula, the environment of zeal for the law, the new growth of literature, the favourite theme of which was the martyrdom of the Maccabees for the sake of the laws about meats, and Esther's abhorrence of her uncircumcised husband,[4] it is easy to understand that the church was gradually displaced from this higher point of view, and once more found a footing on the basis of Judaism.

In Jerusalem itself, then, the struggle with the theocracy had led to the victory of the latter, so long as it did not demand the denial of Jesus from his believers.

It is, on the whole, doubtful whether it would have been desirable for the primitive church to cling less tenaciously to the continuity of the Old Testament development. Of course the apostle Paul desired it; but his own experience told him that the attachment of the Jewish Christians to the law was occasionally a good check upon the immorality of the Greeks, while the massive conceptions of Judaism were equally a counterpoise to the ethereal Platonic images which were not slow to make their way into Christianity. But there is a limit to all things. While the church of Jerusalem was saturated with all the ideas of the Old Testament, the new ideas at once

[1] Gal. vi 13. [2] Gal. ii. 12. [3] Gal. iii. 10.
[4] 4 Macc. iv. seq.; continuation of Esther xiv. xv.

leagued themselves with Philo's school of thought in the Hellenistic churches, so that even where the conduct of life was in question, it did not seem as if the theocracy could produce as strong an impression among the Dispersion as it had successfully produced in its native Jerusalem. The universalist view was victorious in the Gentile world before closer intercourse was established between believers within the Holy Land and those outside.

---

7. Famine and Emigration.

The peculiar position occupied by Herod Agrippa in relation to the imperial house had ensured the Jews a government according to their own laws as long as his reign lasted. It was not until his death that Palestine suffered all the blows which had fallen upon the adjacent provinces throughout the new era of government by women and slaves. There now ensued twenty years of cruel confusion, the ultimate result of which was the war and the ruin of the theocracy. In spite of all his experience of the world, Herod perhaps acted imprudently when, in his eagerness to make the most of exceptional circumstances, he snatched more from Rome than might be given permanently; but it was true slaves' policy for the freedmen of Claudius to imagine they could let this people taste of freedom for three years, and then reduce them to the starvation diet of the procuratorship. We have already indicated the inevitable effect of this measure on the populace.

Moreover, certain measures under Claudius in particular bear the character of purely personal views. The rich province of Syria was made over to a scion of the great Cassian house, C. Cassius Longinus; and while the young Agrippa was refused his father's kingdom, this appointment was masked under the pretext that Rome owed the *manes* of the late king the recall of his enemy Marsus. It is impossible now to discover what

intrigue was at the back of this argument, so well calculated to touch Claudius' superstition. The heir of the Cassii, a better jurist than general, had but dubious success against the Parthians, in spite of the rivalries for the crown on the other side of the Euphrates; and the Parthian question caused unceasing anxiety.[1]

The new proconsul, pedantically stern like all the little Catos and admirers of Brutus and Cassius,[2] set his subordinates a pattern of brutality, henceforward extended to all Jewish questions. As a matter of course, these subordinates were worse than himself. In particular, Cuspius Fadus, a Roman knight, was appointed procurator of the Jewish district. Claudius charged him with the important duty of taking vengeance on the inhabitants of Cæsarea and Sebaste for their insults to the daughter of Agrippa, the sister of his youthful yet neglected friend. More especially, the native garrison, which had taken part in the disturbances following upon the death of the king, were to be punished by being transferred to Pontus, and were to be replaced by Syrian troops. But the Samaritans remonstrated, and the emperor's freedmen found their reasons convincing. Whether the Samaritan envoys really made an impression by their report on the maladministration of the Pharisee-king, or whether the minister Pallas only aimed at securing a slice of the proffered spoils for his brother Felix, it ended by the Samaritans retaining their garrison, and being handed over to Claudius Felix, brother of the favourite, either immediately or within a few years.[3] The latter found it consistent with his high position to take part with his Samaritan subjects in their hatred of the Jews, and the unpunished excesses of his national troops were from this time forth the prime cause of incessant disturbances.[4]

The government in the Jewish provinces was equally unsatisfactory. The deeper significance of the national mourning for

[1] Cf. Tac. Ann. xii. 10—21; Rev. ix. 7, xvi. 12.

[2] Ann. xiii. 48; Suet. Nero, 37. [3] Tac. Ann. 54. [4] Ant. xix. 9, 2.

the death of Herod can only be understood from the scene presented by the country a few months later. All the enemies of Israel raised their heads at the news of the death of Cæsar's friend; Phœnicians and Samaritans in Cæsarea and Sebaste, the Ammonites in Philadelphia beyond Jordan, and in the south the Idumæans and Arabs.[1] So, too, the mere news of the restoration of Gentile government was enough to rouse the patriots of the mountains and caverns, and cover the country with bands of fanatics. National enthusiasm gave an irresistible impulse to these free lances. When they met with Idumæans, Arabs and Ammonites, the advantage rested with the champions of God. Against the Philadelphians, Hannibosheth (Hannibal) of Peræa, with his allies Amaram and Eleazar, made himself master of the debatable land of Mia; while Tolmai the Zealot inflicted equal damage on the south-west borders of the hated sons of Ishmael and Edom. But the fortune of the "Robbers" ended with the appearance of the Roman eagles. Hannibosheth was taken and beheaded; his allies outlawed. Tolmai maintained himself for a time; then he too was brought in and added to the host of patriot martyrs since Judas the Gaulonite who had ended their lives upon the cross on Golgotha. Their adversaries, too, had to attest the skill with which the new governor took his military measures, and after short delay the party of disturbance was overthrown.

But now Cuspius Fadus proceeded to attack the privileges of the priesthood. The high-priest's insignia were to be given up and kept between the feasts in the fortress of Antonia, this appearing to be the only means of securing the fidelity of the highest order. Peace, which had hardly been restored, instantly gave way to a new and dangerous ferment. A general revolt was in preparation; the procurator was compelled to occupy Jerusalem with an armed force. After some sharp encounters, it was agreed that the ringleaders should leave their children with the procurator as hostages for their good behaviour, while

[1] Ant. xx. 1, 1.

Fadus permitted the Jews to petition Claudius in person for the restoration of the high-priest's robes.

The envoys chosen for this purpose were leading men of the Roman party: the son of Keren, who called himself Cornelius; Tryphon, son of Theudas; the son of Nathanael, called Dorotheus; and Jochanan ben Jochanan.[1] On their arrival in Rome, the young Agrippa embraced their cause with all the eagerness of a pretender wishing to keep his place in the memory of the nation. As it turned out, he succeeded in convincing the politicians of Rome that what the procurator called a formal symbol of empire, was to the Jews a mystic profanation of what they held most sacred. Yet under all the impression remained that a Roman governor would always outrage Jewish religious feeling, and that the country was on the verge of renewing the old quarrel bred by misunderstandings, which had made the former relation to Rome so intolerable.

But Narcissus and Pallas did not come to the conclusion confidently expected by the young Herod. Granted that the procurator's authority in all religious matters was abolished, still the kingdom of Agrippa was not restored. It seemed enough to appoint king Herod of Chalcis, brother of the dead Herod Agrippa, as commissary to supervise the temple. The high-priest's head-dress and robes were restored to the keeping of the priests, who thought it so important to preserve them from defilement; while the emperor's approval was made necessary for all regulations affecting the temple, in which symbolical correctness of arrangement was a serious theological question. As the temple treasures were likewise put under the king's supervision, no pretext was left for suspecting the possibility of the Gentiles laying covetous hands on the Corban. Finally, the right of appointing and deposing high-priests was also given to Herod of Chalcis, who promptly removed the house of Cantheras, introduced by Agrippa, and gave the Jews a new high-priest in Joseph ben Camith.[2]

[1] Ant. xx. 2, 2.

[2] Ant. xx. 1, 3; Derenbourg, Palest. 230.

A complete division of power had now been introduced, as the Jews were subject to their own law in municipal matters and kept their Sahedrins. The question was, how long would it endure? A military government was ultimately retained for the sole purpose of punishing political misdemeanour and ratifying sentence of death; agitation in the synagogue and temple, and the progress of the parties in opposition at the expense of the theocratic dominion itself, were, on the other hand, left entirely free. The Jews, therefore, had too many privileges to be obedient—too little freedom to be content. Rome wished to spare religious prejudices; but the mere fact of a Gentile occupation was beyond all things offensive to popular sentiment, and offered a perpetual object for attack.

It is now no longer possible to ascertain the causes that provoked the several conflicts, for a general disruption of social ties had begun. Moreover, the upheaval now assumed entirely religious forms. There appeared a prophet, Theudas, who assured the people that the day of salvation would begin beyond Jordan, just as was assumed by the Baptist, according to the well-known saying of Isaiah about the way of the Lord in the wilderness.

The former scenes by the Jordan seemed to be revived. The concourse of the multitude was hardly less than in those days; vast crowds came, goods and all, to follow the camp of the prophet.[1] Like other prophets, Theudas was met by the well-known cry of the populace, "Show us a sign." Without an instant's delay, he promised Israel, as they thronged round him, the sign which Joshua promised to their fathers when he led them over Jordan. "And it shall come to pass, as soon as the soles of the feet of the priests that bear the ark of the Lord shall rest in the waters of Jordan, that the waters of Jordan shall be cut off from the waters that come down from above, and they shall stand upon an heap."[2] Nothing less than this was offered by the

[1] Ant. xx. 5, 1, points to far larger masses than the "about 400 men" of the Acts, v. 36.

[2] Josh. iii. 13.

prophet to his believers; and his confidence was effectual. A vast multitude followed him, with all their goods, to cross Jordan by the passage which should open at Theudas' mighty word, and go to meet the wondrous dawn of the kingdom.

If it were permissible to infer the rest of the prophet's scheme from the third chapter of the Book of Joshua, from which his programme is taken, there would seem a secondary reference to the expulsion of the Canaanites, Amorites, Jebusites—in short, the Gentiles—whose dominion was to be overthrown under the personal guidance of Jehovah. There was perhaps a further expectation of that other miracle of Joshua's, promised a few years later by an Egyptian Jew, who meant to overthrow the walls of Jerusalem by his voice, as Joshua the walls of Jericho by the blast of his trumpets.

This seems to have been the view of Cuspius Fadus; for without waiting for the inevitable disillusionment of the multitude encamped beside Jordan, he sent his cavalry against them. The multitude was dispersed, cut to pieces or made prisoner; and the head of the new Joshua was brought back to Jerusalem. Instead of the looked-for day of the Messiah, the people saw the prophet's head set on the city wall.

Of all such risings, this was the most important, as it is recorded alike by Josephus, the Acts and Eusebius. The appearance of these false Messiahs being regarded as a sign that the advent of the true Messiah could not be long delayed, this warning was now introduced into the discourses of Jesus on the last things: "Take heed that no man deceive you; for many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many."[1] In course of time this warning must have been extended to all manner of different false prophets and Messiahs.[2]

Fadus' ill success in pacifying this unruly province at last caused displeasure at Rome. The procurator was recalled soon after the rising of Theudas. Once more the authorities were ready to make partial concessions. If the transference of the

[1] Matt. xxiv. 4.   [2] Matt. xxiv. 24.

management of the temple to a Herod had not sufficed to get rid of friction with the military authorities, it was important to Judaize this department as well. But instead of simply re-instating a Jewish vassal-king, it was thought sufficient to appoint as procurator a nephew of Philo, and son of the alabarch Alexander, TIBERIUS ALEXANDER, who had adopted Roman manners. Now this was intended as an open concession to the Jews; and it could not be doubted that Philo's nephew would keep on good terms with his kinsman Herod of Chalcis, who had charge of the temple. Only one point had been overlooked by the enlightened government of the Claudian freedmen. The Jews would a hundred times rather have endured a Gentile than a renegade. Great was the astonishment of Pallas, Narcissus and Polybius, to find this stiff-necked people respond to the appointment of their compatriot with a new insurrection. Philo's nephew had to begin his government of the Holy Land with the crucifixion of James and Simon, two sons of the famous Judas the Gaulonite, whose family, like new Maccabees, continued the struggle of their ancestors to the third and fourth generation. But it was vain to heap up new skulls on Golgotha. The people offered an unwearying resistance. To the guilt of his own apostasy, Philo's nephew had now added the blood of the popular heroes. What availed it that the father had presented the temple with gates of gold, if they remained closed against the renegade son? Tiberius Alexander could never make himself tolerable even to the nobility of the temple. For there may well be some connection between these conflicts and the fact that once more Herod of Chalcis deprived Joseph ben Camith of the dignity he had scarcely received, and gave it to Hananiah ben Nebedai, who is represented in Josephus and the Acts as a hot and violent enemy of the Pharisees.[1] It is, perhaps, due to his pronounced opposition to the party of action, that he managed

1 Acts xxiii. 2, seq.; Ant. xx. 5, 2.

to retain the high-priesthood for fully ten years in this period of passionate strife.[1]

On the other hand, Philo's nephew enjoyed no long stay, despite the strong measures he took to attain his ends. It may be that he pressed for his own recall, truly recognizing how small was his chance of peace with the people he had deserted. He re-entered the army, and took a conspicuous part in Corbulo's campaign against the Parthians in 54.[2]

In his stead, VENTIDIUS CUMANUS came to Palestine in the year 48. This time the young Agrippa was to receive something at all events to make up for his former disappointment. Too young in 44 to rule the people who loved his house, in 48 he was old enough for another people that hated him for a Jew. His uncle at Chalcis had died, and the Syrians there received him as their sovereign. At the same time, he succeeded to the supervision of the temple.

Three changes of the administration had thus become necessary in four years. This short time had now seen a third procurator and a third high-priest; it had provoked three great risings, and delivered countless patriots to death by the sword or the cross.

Still, though the experiment of 44 had failed utterly, it would not be fair to throw all the blame of failure upon the Roman administration. The force of circumstances was such as no human power could avert. From 44 to 48, in the words of the Apocalypse, hunger rode through the land clashing a pair of balances; for in these years corn was no longer sold by measure, but weighed out like some rare merchandize. Herod Agrippa's oppressive taxation may have contributed towards the impoverishment of the common people; it was followed by a failure of crops; and infinite misery came upon the wretched

[1] Herod of Chalcis died in the eighth year of Claudius, i.e. 48, Ant. xx. 5, 2; Hananiah ben Nebedai was removed shortly before the departure of Felix, xx. 8, 8.

[2] Tac. Ann. xv. 28.

inhabitants. In the year of Herod's death, the Christian brethren at Antioch, according to the Acts, were visited by prophets from Jerusalem, who, after the manner of their kind, spoke of the approaching famine in the form of a prophecy, foretelling a great famine over the whole world.[1]

The bad harvests began under Cuspius Fadus, and lasted without intermission till the time of Tiberius Alexander.[2] The emperor was fully occupied at home in pacifying the Roman mob, who clamoured at the scarcity. There the famine had begun to be felt as early as 42,[3] and Claudius himself had the misfortune to fall in with a riotous crowd in the forum, incensed by the high prices; his toga was torn, and he himself was pelted with crusts, and had great difficulty in escaping to the palace. The consequence was that every magazine in the provinces was emptied. In order to have sufficient supplies for the capital always at hand, the terrified emperor declared himself ready to insure the corn-ships against the storms of winter; he guaranteed every one who built a corn-ship exemption from the *lex Papia Poppæa*, which laid a certain penalty on the unmarried; he even went so far as to give Latins the full franchise and women the rights of a mother of four children, provided they devoted themselves to this form of speculation.[4] In the same way the harbour of Ostia, with its vast moles, was a work due to the fears of the Cæsar, intended to make the mouth of the Tiber practicable for the heavy barges.[5]

Thus not only had the provincials nothing to hope from the imperial government, but the stores of Alexandria, as being nearest, were seized by the government for their own purposes. The Holy City was under "the gnawing power of hunger," as Josephus

1 Acts xi. 28—30.

2 Ant. iii. 15, 3, the original authority, according to which the culminating point of the famine occurs during the high-priesthood of Ishmael. This name must refer to the son of Cantheras, who was high-priest under Fadus, and bore the surname Elionæus, for Ishmael ben Phabi was not high-priest till the time of Nero.

3 Dio, 60, 11; cf. 10 and 16.

4 Suet. Claud. 19.

5 Dio, 60, 11.

puts it. Yet he tells, as an instance of ancient greatness, how, while the people were dying of hunger in crowds, the priests, themselves starving, offered the forty-one due measures of corn at the Passover, not a grain being used for any other purpose. "It is corban, a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me," was once Jesus' scornful criticism of these Pharisees.[1] According to the reminiscences of the Apocalypse, one measure of wheat (i.e. two handfuls, or cotylæ), or three measures of barley, cost a denarius or sevenpence-halfpenny, and therefore one day's ration of bread a whole day's wages.[2]

The prices given by Josephus are still higher, for at the Passover, when the winter stores were consumed, one assaron cost four denarii, the normal price being twelve for half a denarius.[3] These were the days in which a man like Theudas wished to lead the starving people across Jordan to a land flowing with milk and honey—the time of the third seal, of which the Apocalypse says: "When the Lamb had opened the third seal, I heard the third beast say, Come and see. And I beheld, and lo, a black horse, and he that sat on him had a pair of balances in his hand. And I heard a voice in the midst of the four beasts say: A measure of wheat for a penny, and three measures of barley for a penny; and see thou hurt not the oil and the wine."

The only reason for excepting oil and wine from the blight must lie in the clear recollection of actual experience. If the writer of the Apocalypse had been simply creating from his imagination, he would not have weakened his picture by such reservations, while he might equally well have named higher prices. On this occasion too, as is always the case in famines, those provisions lasted longest which are less suited to the ordinary needs of life. When the seed-corn was consumed, the common man might look bitterly at the olives and vines thriving

1 Mark vii. 11; Jos. Ant. iii. 15, 3, xx. 2, 6.

2 Rev. vi. 5, seq.; Tac. Ann. i. 1; Matt. xx. 2; Diod. Sic. xix. 49; Ael. V. Hist. i. 26; Xen. Anab. i. 5, 6.

3 Cic. Verr. iii. 81.

in the rich man's plantation close to his own meagre crop of corn.

Meanwhile this terrible famine aroused a warm humanitarian feeling. The Jewish and the Christian camp both vaunted their proselytes. Before long, the Rabbis Hananiah and Eleazar succeeded in bringing over to the synagogue all the royal family of Adiabene, the noble head of which, pious queen Helena, made her first visit to the temple during the great famine. So deeply was she touched by the sight of the poor literally dying of hunger in the streets, that she devoted all her means to buying corn-ships in Alexandria, and bringing cargos of dried figs over from Cyprus. The Jews never forgot her benefits. Pausanias,[1] Eusebius and Hieronymus, still found grateful Jews in Jerusalem to point out the grave of the pious queen and of her royal son Izates, who was also well disposed to the Jews.

Nor were the proselytes of the Christian church less active, according to the Acts. The brethren in Antioch, themselves impoverished by their community of goods and the sale of their lands, sent relief to Jerusalem, although it can hardly have been Paul who, with Barnabas, conveyed the gifts to their destination.[2]

Still the scarcity did not cease. Not only did the bad harvests continue,[3] but after the famine the new scarcity was accompanied by pestilence, an invariable conjunction of evils in Palestine from the remotest times.[4] Sterile by nature, Judæa became so desolate that in some districts wild beasts increased in alarming numbers; while during the rebellion, besides pestilence, famine and wild beasts, the Roman sword spread destruction. What we should sum up in the three words, "war, blight and pestilence," is terribly depicted by the oriental prophet as the time when power was given to Death. "When the Lamb opened the fourth seal, I heard the voice of the fourth beast say, Come and

1 In the time of Hadrian; cf. Perieges. i. 5, 5.

2 Gal. ii. 1, against Acts xi. 30.

3 Fresh famine, Rev. vi. 8.

4 Ant. xv. 9, 11.

see. And I looked, and behold, a pale horse; and his name that sat on him was Death, and Hell followed with him. And power was given unto them over the fourth part of the earth, to kill with sword and with hunger and with death, and with the beasts of the earth."[1]

It is not only that the writer of the Apocalypse regarded war, famine and death, the ruling powers of this year, as riders who ride before him that is to come in the time of the seventh seal on a white horse, wearing the crown upon his head. The writer of the eschatology gave the same form to the series of "woes" which precede the birth of the Messiah. "And ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars; see that ye be not troubled, for all these things must come to pass, but the end is not yet. For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom; and there shall be famines and pestilences and earthquakes in divers places."[2] From such fragments of contemporary prophecy, a very fair picture may be gathered of the prophetic assemblies of the church in Jerusalem, both before and after, although he for whose return they had now been waiting more than ten years still delayed his coming.

The terrible years of famine, however, are in a certain sense a chapter in the history of the Palestinian church. From this point the writer of the Apocalypse does not continue the image of the riders in his book of fate, but proceeds to a new scene. We know little of the church in Palestine during the following years, perhaps a sign that little happened. The interest of the Acts, too, turns from the churches to the Gentiles. It is true that the church is often mentioned, but only as "the poor of Jerusalem," for whom collections are made everywhere abroad, and for whom Paul organizes a noble movement of charity among those who themselves were in need. Not only did gifts of the churches pour into Jerusalem, but the poor from Jerusalem overflowed upon the churches without. Many came here as witnesses of the days by Jordan or the Lake of Gennesareth, who had really

[1] Rev. xix. 11—16. [2] Matt. xxiv. 6, 7.

been driven from home, not by missionary zeal, but by hunger. "For ye suffer," cries Paul indignantly to the Corinthians when visited by such guests, "if a man devour you, if a man take of you." He speaks of many hucksters who go round hawking the gospel, instead of preaching it with a pure intent—of messengers of God, whose god is their belly. Indeed, this disorder has spread so widely that Paul accounts it his special glory not to have done as these burdensome guests, but to have earned his own bread. "No man shall stop me of this boasting in the regions of Achaia." Thus there can be no doubt that the scarcity, lasting since the middle of the forties, weighed heavily on the church, and the proportionately large space occupied in the Epistles of Paul by purely material cares and reproaches are accounted for by the deep misery in which we see the poor church of the Hebrews plunged.

But the greater the stress of the present, the more longingly was the sign of the Saviour watched for. It is thoroughly in accord with the feelings of this suffering community for the book of a native writer to end with the words, "Come, Lord Jesus," while from heaven is heard the answer, "Surely I come quickly."

Fifth Division.

THE EARLY CHURCHES OF THE DISPERSION.

THE EARLY CHURCHES OF THE DISPERSION.

1. Form of Dissemination.

The deliberate propaganda of Hellenistic Judaism was at an end. This was the result of the struggles under Caligula. But now in the time of Claudius the new Christian ideas spread from the very home of the Hebrews over the whole empire, not as the preaching of monotheism, not as a philosophic doctrine, not as a conscious attempt at organization, but in the most irrational form conceivable, a popular ecstatic movement. It is a striking sight to see the ancient and skilfully contrived channels of communication, great and small, among the Jewish Dispersion, filled with the spirit which had first found expression in the wilderness of Judah, beside the Jordan, in Samaria, and beside the Sea of Gennesareth. The secret of the rapid spread of Christianity is not, as has so often been said, the unity of the Roman empire, but the pervading presence of the Jewish nation, whose ramifications spread over both the great empires of the world, the Roman and the Parthian.

It is this peculiar organization of the Jewish people which is responsible for spreading the religious agitations of Jerusalem. These, regularly breaking out at the great feasts, were simply transplanted without external assistance by the returning pilgrims, before the bearers were actually conscious of the part they played. But the tidings of the Messiah's appearance and crucifixion must have spread all the faster among the Dispersion, the more paradoxical they sounded to a Jewish ear. The Word always exercised its missionary power, though without regularly

prepared missions, in proportion to knowledge of the teachings of Jesus and capacity for an ideal conception of the kingdom. Here too, as has always been the case with great spiritual movements, there was no need of preparations, or concerted plans, or a mission. Jesus' parable of the seed growing of itself[1] found most definite fulfilment: "So is the kingdom of God as if a man should cast seed into the ground, and should sleep and rise night and day, and the seed should spring and grow up, he knoweth not how. For the earth bringeth forth fruit of herself; first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear."

So it would always be vain to attempt to discover the individual agencies through which the new spirit made its way here or there into a Jewish community. In particular we have no information on this point with regard to the chief centres of the new doctrine, Rome, Ephesus and Alexandria. But the fact remains that within twenty years the knowledge of the good tidings had reached all the great towns of the Mediterranean, while in some places we can point to churches with the same organization and the same object as the church in Palestine.

This process is primarily to be described as a spread of the apocalyptic tendency among the Jews to the Jewish Dispersion, which disseminated it throughout the Roman empire. The preaching of the coming kingdom of God, first undertaken in the wilderness of Judah, is repeated and imitated in the Dispersion, so that we see the eventful movement which had agitated Palestine since the days of the Baptist transferred to the ghettos of Asia Minor and the populace of Greek and Latin cities, there to create a form of religious life connected with Jewish and Greek culture and yet original.

It is precisely where we have direct evidence of the origin of a church, and are not compelled to rely on conjecture, that the apocalyptic expectation proves to be the mainspring of the whole movement. We can follow its fiery traces over all the journeys of St. Paul, although doctrinaire methods for the ex-

[1] Mark iv. 26.

tension of Christianity might have been expected from him as a Hellenist and a thinker.

If it be asked what expectations Paul aroused among the Galatian churches in the heart of Asia Minor, his teaching was: "In due season we shall reap; as we have therefore opportunity, let us do good."[1] With this season in prospect, the Galatians received Paul as a herald of the coming Messiah.[2] The Spirit was poured out upon them, and prophecy, miraculous powers and tongues, betokened the near approach of the kingdom.[3]

Thus at the end of the year 53, Paul passes over from Troas to Neapolis, from the East to the West. His hearers are no longer visionary orientals, but keen Hellenic Jews. But all the same, in speaking to them, he brings every point into relation to the last judgment now approaching. The word has come upon them, and they shine as lights "in the day of Christ."[4] "Their conversation is in heaven, from whence also we look for the Saviour, Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself."[5] Even from Rome the greeting to the church is, "The Lord is at hand."[6]

From the inland city of Philippi, the Apostle turned to the maritime city of Thessalonica. Here again the same great principle underlies his preaching. The day of judgment will come as a thief in the night, as sudden destruction falling upon them.[7] He compares the situation to a woman with child. She knows that her time is coming, but the actual travail will come unexpectedly upon her.

When, however, several members of the church died before seeing the great hour, the survivors turned angrily upon Paul. But he replied: "If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with

[1] Gal. vi. 9, 10. [2] Gal. iv. 14. [3] Gal. iii. 2, 5, iv. 6.
[4] Phil. ii. 15. [5] Phil. iii. 20, seq. [6] Phil. iv. 5.
[7] 1 Thess. v. 1—11.

him. . . . . For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words."[1]

The apostle pursues his missionary journey deeper into the Greek world, comparing it to a procession of the Messiah, round whom float clouds of incense as in triumph. The synagogue and Jewish quarter of Corinth also received the great tidings of the Messiah. Here, again, Paul did not come forward with the watchword of any philosophy, but with the proof of the Holy Ghost and power,[2] with signs, wonders and manifestation of powers.[3] Nor is there only debate over the resurrection of the dead, the bodies in which they will come,[4] and the day on which the saints will judge the angels;[5] the belief roots itself so firmly, men's minds are so deeply moved, that the Corinthian Jews go out to the tombs of their dead and are baptised upon their graves in place of the departed, that the latter may share in the glory soon to come.[6] Amid what tumult these mystical scenes took place is vividly described by Paul, 1 Cor. xii.—xiv., in the section upon possession by the Spirit.

It follows that the *substance* of the message which spread from town to town in the otherwise tranquil reign of Claudius, was the approaching regeneration of the world. The *form*, however, in which this expansion took place was that of an ecstatic agitation, spreading contagiously; of enthusiasm rousing enthusiasm; of prophecy engendering new prophecy; of miraculous powers that compelled others to work wonders.

In the first place, of course, these new Christian churches appeared as mere fragments of Judaism. It was as if fresh life and activity had sprung up in the venerable Jewish stock, making it put forth new buds and shoots. A new life, in part

[1] 1 Thess. iv. 13—18. [2] 1 Cor. ii. 4, 5. [3] 2 Cor. xii. 12.
[4] 1 Cor. xv. 35. [5] 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3. [6] 1 Cor. xv. 29.

noisy and tumultuous, had entered the Jewish quarters of the great cities, a process which usually ended in the separation of a minority which clung to the tidings of the appearance of the kingdom. Yet the disproportionate number of Greek proselytes in these newly-established churches soon gave offence. News and writings that made their way from Jerusalem found the readiest welcome, not in the true stock of Jewish families, but in the forecourt of the proselytes, among the great crowd of friends of the Jews and believing Greek women. It became clear that the true descendants of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, though they might show themselves dead to religion, were a far safer possession of the synagogue than the children of uncircumcision lately won over to Judaism. For if a man were drawn to the schools of the Jews by a religious need, the same need might alienate him from it as soon as he found better spiritual food elsewhere. "Trust not the proselyte though he be in the fortieth generation," said a wise teacher; and we find the bitterness and anger of the reproaches which the teachers heaped on the proselytes, "this scab of Israel," as Rabbi Eliezer designated them,[1] proportionately to the eagerness with which the Rabbis of this century flung themselves into proselytizing, when once the anti-Gentile school of Rabbi Shammai was overthrown.

The course of this development is not difficult to follow. The proselyte at last found in the synagogue nothing of what he sought there. Certainly not a purely spiritual religion; for although the ritual and sensuous element was kept in the background during worship, it laid hold the more oppressively upon life. Above all, not the fulfilment of the Messianic promise, which yet found the strongest echo in devout or poetic souls. This was the circle which must have been most deeply agitated as the news now spread from synagogue to synagogue, telling how Galilee and Jerusalem were full of the appearance of the Messiah, whose advent had won so many proselytes; while the gospel of the Galilean passed from hand to hand, giving them

1 Cf. Derenbourg, Palest. après les Thalmuds, p. 228, seq.

back monotheism in an infinitely more lofty and soul-stirring form; adding the pearls of Jesus' sayings to the literature of the Old Testament, and expressly sanctioning their natural disinclination towards the extravagant ordinances of the law.

The Jew born held the belief in a coming Messiah as an ancient and ancestral dogma, apart from the claims of any individual Messiah; the proselyte had approached this hope by himself, and received it as a promise given to him personally. If the Jew of the Dispersion, aloof from the struggles in Palestine, could not fail to look with mistrust on the tidings that the unprecedented was to happen precisely in his own days, the proselyte was the more inclined to see the fulfilment of all he had constantly looked for. The Jew clung to Jehovah by force of early habit; prayer to Him followed official formulæ, to alter which seemed profanity. In the eyes of the proselyte, these formulæ were an expression of his own choosing for religious life. He could reject them if the "Our Father" of the Galilean Christ gave fuller expression to his feelings and the impulse which had driven him from the heathen temples. For the Jew, the form of life pleasing to God was the law; for the proselyte, the law was something strange, which he respected more or less for the sake of the high authority of the Old Testament, but would gladly be released from by another authority. "Of the Greeks," says Josephus, "many have come over to our law. Some remain in it, but others could not endure its restrictions, and left it again."[1] Release from the law on principle must have been eminently desirable in such a state of feeling; and so Jesus' denunciations of the Pharisees and the observation of the law found here a more attentive audience than was likely to be found in the hall of Solomon.

Now with this spread of the news from synagogue to synagogue, whether borne by rumour or the written gospel or perhaps by some homeward-bound pilgrim, Christian churches sprang up in all the great cities—churches, indeed, which, as the Acts say

[1] Ap. 2, 10.

in passing of the Ephesians, were instructed in the way of the Lord, but with imperfect knowledge.[1]

Thus Christianity should be spoken of as appearing, rather than being disseminated, among all the great cities of the Mediterranean, as the whole process took place primarily without an apostolate. One idea above all must be given up: it was not Paul who first introduced the tidings of the Messiah to the Dispersion by his life of regular mission-work. It was due to no one man. Christianity spread as the belief in a catastrophe impending over the whole world, which the Messiah of the Jews was to introduce. This belief first laid hold upon Palestine, and then upon the Jewish communities of the Dispersion, whence it was soon to bring the Gentile world under its sway.

It consisted primarily in the excitement of popular emotion under the form of ecstasy, which obtained assurance of the Messiah's presence in prophecy, speaking with tongues, visions and miraculous cures, and filled all the great cities with wonder. This mode of dissemination at once excludes Paul as the sole source of all Gentile Christianity—not to mention the fact that the central churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus and Rome, had already come into existence before Paul visited these cities. The idea of the kingdom of God had taken an independent course through the world. Paul did not create it, but was created by it.

Even the little direct testimony from the time of the first spread of Christianity can only be understood if explained from conditions similar to those in which we find Christianity standing in the second and third centuries. If its activity sixty or a hundred years later was still limited to work on a small scale, it can certainly not have been as magnificent in the first century as it was afterwards imagined to be. Just as Paul's activity, as shown by his Epistles, lay not in the agora and forum, but in workshops and private houses, so likewise in the first century those untiring mockers of Christianity, Lucian and

[1] Acts xviii. 26.

Celsus, know nothing of any public activity on the part of the Christians, which would certainly have met with their ridicule if it had existed.

The new doctrines spread by their own contagion, not by public oratory. The hidden springs whence this mighty stream of influence flowed were the workshops and servants' rooms, where workman whispered it to workman, slave to slave; or the silent gatherings where they read the books of the Old Testament, the Gospels, and the sayings of the Lord, to the general edification. Hence the spread of Christianity had no resemblance to the manner in which to-day, according to mission reports, certain missionaries caricature the history of the Acts, by standing at street corners and preaching to Hindus till they are driven from their post by showers of stones or stop for want of breath. Paul's method was different. He first looked about for work, and then found his way into families and workshops, and, where possible, the synagogues, conformably to the usual manner of life. Such a mission is withal more effectual than the oratorical proceedings into which later imagination glorified the dry and prosaic reality.

But the silent manner of the growth of Christianity finds its best attestation in the writings of its opponents. They have before them no public appearance of Christians to provoke their mockery. Indeed, they reproach them with their underground machinations in unfeigned indignation.[1] The new religion has its followers among the commonalty; one opens to another that which delivered him from sin and gave him faith and inward life. He is silent before the reproach of his superior and the witticism of the sophist, modelling himself upon Jesus, who vouchsafed no answer to Herod and was silent even before Pilate. It is the very fact of this new doctrine not being disseminated through the schools, but making its way from below before it can be grappled with, that is so annoying to its

[1] Besides the reff. below to Celsus and Lucian, cf. Tac. Ann. 15, 14, and Plin. Ep. 10, 97.

adversaries, who become visibly alarmed at these subterranean murmurs.

Thus Celsus, in his "True History," which Origen thinks deserving of a supplementary refutation, says that Christians are not people such as are to be met in polite society, but weavers, cobblers, tanners, people without polish or manners, who dare not utter a word before elder householders, men of understanding; but if only they get wives and children of their own, they speak the most wonderful things, and make out that they should not cling to their fathers and teachers, but should follow them only. They are eaten up with vanity and can do nothing good. They alone know the right way of life; if children follow them, they will be happy and make the house happy.[1]

Such, then, were the forms in which the spread of the new faith took place. Business relations between Jewish houses imported the seeds of the new doctrine with the bales of goods; the regular intercommunication among the synagogues spread the tidings still farther; and so it came to pass that the news was disseminated from one great city to another, while the intermediate districts were passed by, till such a one as Paul devoted himself to systematically searching the Gentile world for the sons of the promise, and carrying the word to those "who had not yet heard."[2]

---

2. The Spread of Christianity in the Great Cities.

The first to be influenced by Jesus' idea and his followers' firm conviction that he was the Messiah, were naturally the neighbouring Syrian Jews.

The scattering of Jesus' Hellenistic followers in 36 by Paul's persecution, immediately called into life a number of Christian communities in Samaria hard by, and then in the cities of the

[1] Orig. κατὰ Κέλσου, 3, 50, seq. [2] Rom. x. 14.

sea-coast. According to the Acts, Philip's healing and exorcism in the city of Samaria had the chief share in bringing the name of the Galilean who had been crucified a year since, to the Samaritans, after the latter had already felt the shock of another Messianic movement in their own province.[1]

We found the recollection of this parallel preaching of the kingdom from Tirathaba in the history of Simon Magus, although none but vague accounts of the mutual relations between the supporters of either side could have been extant at the time the Acts were written.

A further reference to the spread of Christianity from the same source carries us to Gaza, south of the Holy City. As a Gentile town, Gaza offered security from the watchful eye of the Sanhedrin;[2] as the starting-point of the caravan routes to the Gulf of Aela and the Red Sea, it opened the way to Arabia, Egypt and Ethiopia.[3] One portion of the latter country, viz. the peninsula of Meroë enclosed by the upper branch of the Nile, was at this time under the rule of warlike queens, bearing the title of Candace.[4] Thus it is that the memory of the way in which Christianity made its way from Gaza into Africa, there to secure a permanent footing, is connected with a eunuch of the treasury of Meroë, who was met by Philip the deacon on the way from Jerusalem to Gaza.[5]

Ashdod[6] also, which is not far off, is mentioned in the same connection by the Acts. With Ascalon to the south and Jamnia to the north, it had belonged first to the Herodian Salome, then to the empress Livia, and now was an imperial domain administered by the Treasury.[7] We have already made acquaintance with the Roman governor there, Herennius Capito, as a vehement

[1] Acts viii.
[2] Ant. xv. 7, 3, xvii. 11, 4.
[3] Cf. Vol. i. p. 66 (Eng. trans.).
[4] Dio Cass. 54, 5; Plin. vi. 35, 8.
[5] Eus. H. E. 2, 1.
[6] Acts viii. 40.
[7] Ant. xvii. 8, 1; 11, 5; xviii. 2, 2. Since the death of the empress, 782 A.U.C. (28 A.D.), it had been a basilicate, whence comes the name Basilith. An ἐπίτροπος Σεβαστοῦ ἀρχῆς Λιυιανῆς appears in inscriptions as late as Caracalla: Werlhof. Bibl. Numism. i. 68.

opponent of the Jews. The Christian Hellenists had therefore good reason to feel themselves safe here from the persecutions of the Sanhedrin.

But Ashdod had always been the scene of a struggle between Gentiles and Jews; and while at Jamnia, the capital of the basilicate, the Pharisees had obtained the upper hand through the support of Salome, the Gentiles were supreme at Ashdod. National antipathy was at the moment once more greatly excited, as might be expected in the district where the struggle over Cæsar-worship had broken out.

Secondly, this must have been one of those places where there existed a strong body of that intermediate class of Jews in the Roman service and Roman officials in the following of the synagogue: publicans and proselytes. These, owing to their strained relations with the zealots, would, from the first, have contributed many hearers to Christianity.

The same would be true in a higher degree of CÆSAREA, which at this time was the seat of the procurator, and contained a Roman fort and garrison; while the numerous population of sailors, dock labourers and foreign merchants, pushed the Jewish element into the background. The church which grew up here was of great importance in later church history, and is more often mentioned than any other in the apostolic age.[1]

In the Clementine story, which relates Peter's disputation with Simon Magus up to this point, Cæsarea is one of the noblest among the original centres of Christianity; the captain Cornelius, who arrests the Magus and brings him to Cæsarea, is a source of pride to the Roman writer. In the view of the Acts, this centurion of the Italian cohort perhaps only represents symbolically the first contact of Christianity with the Gentiles and the Roman army.

As in Cæsarea, so must we picture the situation of the church

[1] Acts x. 1, 24, xi. 11, viii. 40, ix. 30, xviii. 22, xxi. 8, xxiv. 27. By about 200 A.D., Cæsarea is the seat of a bishop, who was actually metropolitan of the bishopric of Jerusalem up to the council of Chalcedon. Euseb. H. E. 5. 22, 23; 2, 25.

as we meet it in the year 59 in PTOLEMAIS, a commercial and manufacturing town.[1] Throughout this group of churches the name of Philip the deacon was held in high honour. He lived in Cæsarea with his four daughters, who prophesied,[2] and it was to his activity that the spread of Christianity into the plain of Sephela and Sharon was ascribed.[3]

LYDDA and JOPPA, according to the Acts, maintained direct relations with the church of Jerusalem. Both were Jewish towns; and the Jewish type was kept by their Christian churches.[4] In the strongly Jewish town Lydda,[5] where, in 66, there were only fifty persons who did not go up to the feast of Tabernacles in Jerusalem, they told of a miraculous cure worked by Simon Peter upon a lame man named Æneas; and in Joppa, the Jewish port *par excellence*,[6] similar memories attached to the name of the pious and beneficent Tabitha, i.e. "the Gazelle."[7] The centre of the brethren at Joppa was the house of Simon the tanner, near the sea.[8]

Now clear as it is that the narrative of the Acts as to the origin of the several churches is interwoven with symbolical threads—certain though it be that the oratorical matter belongs to the writer, and that the selection of the narratives serves the whole purpose of the book, namely, to bring the figures of the two Apostles closer together—still it must be acknowledged that the sources used by the author were in remarkable harmony with the facts. It is wholly consonant with truth for these sources to represent the spread of Christianity as essentially a belief based on miracles spreading through the lower classes. The essential import of these original sources was to record the cases in which the risen Jesus confirmed his Messiahship by acts of healing and the expulsion of devils. We find Peter by the bed of the paralytic,[9] by the bier of the dead;[10] we hear of Philip driving out demons amid the shrieks of the

[1] Acts. xxi. 7.
[2] Acts xxi. 8, viii. 40.
[3] Acts viii. 40, xxi. 9.
[4] Acts ix. 36—39, v. 9.
[5] Bell. ii. 19, 1.
[6] Cf. Vol. i. p. 64.
[7] Acts ix. 36, x. 5, xi. 5, 13.
[8] Acts x. 32.
[9] Acts ix. 33.
[10] Acts ix. 39.

afflicted, and restoring strength to the maimed and the halt;[1] we see how, after prayer from the apostles, the Spirit descends upon all who hear, so that they speak in tongues and praise God.[2] In brief, we meet here with that mysterious advance of enthusiastic movements which has often been remarked, spreading irresistibly from place to place. To call it by the name of a contagious enthusiasm is far from deciding upon its intrinsic value.

Syria throughout is the especial home of such spasmodic forms of revivalism; and in the view of the original source of the Acts, such clearly was the process by which Christianity spread. Faith in Jesus' Messiahship was given by his word; but first the conviction of his actually operative power, and the awful proofs of his nearness, engendered the feeling that the promised One stood at the door and knocked, that he was at hand, and would soon reveal himself in wrath and terror. The first impulse once given, it would be long before the movement calmed down again, for the secret of existence is fearfully exciting to man when once he has given up his unthinking neglect of the riddle of life.

The apostles' miraculous successes in the cities of Palestine, and as far as Greece, were a common theme in the rising churches, as is shown by the impression produced by this form of activity. Paul has not the slightest doubt of the "miracles of the apostle;" he only claims them for himself, and indeed, for members of almost all the churches.[3]

To go outside Palestine, a church in DAMASCUS finds early mention in connection with the persecution of Stephen. This church was doubtless started from Galilee by immediate followers of Jesus. As the trade route to Damascus led by Capernaum to Ptolemais, there is no need to introduce further intermediate links to explain this church. The Jews of Damascus were as excitable as they were numerous, and Josephus plumes himself on the fact that all the women in the city were devoted to Judaism.[4] Amid so lively an interchange of religious

[1] Acts viii. 4—8.
[2] Acts x. 44.
[3] 2 Cor. xii. 12.
[4] Jos. Bell. ii. 20, 2.

thought, there could not fail "to be men and women found here of *this* way" (i.e. of the Christian school), as it is said in the Acts.[1] A disciple Ananias is also mentioned by name. In the house of Judas, which was in the street called Straight, he heals Paul of his bodily and spiritual blindness, and washes away his sins in baptism.[2]

Still more important was the rise of Christianity in ANTIOCH. Once more, the Acts make it originate with Hellenists driven from Jerusalem,[3] some being Cypriotes and Cyrenians, who after this renewed their connection with the church of Jerusalem by means of their fellow-countryman Barnabas, the "mediator."[4] Thereupon the Syrian establishment acquired a new centre as it were. Compared with ANTIOCH, Jerusalem was so little better than a remote provincial town, that it is not astonishing to find the church of Antioch before long of more importance for the spread of Christianity than the parent church itself.

The capital of Syria, in size and position admittedly the third city of the Roman world,[5] and containing a population of half-a-million, Antioch offered a very different field for religious propagandism than the city of priests and Levites on Zion, which, moreover, was satiated with the religious life, and was at once dulled and fanatical, like all centres of bigotry. On the other hand, the ancient capital of the Syrian kings, now the residence of the Roman proconsul, was a medley of every possible nationality, and consequently the centre of a grand commingling of religion, to which Rome, Hellas, Macedon and Syria, had each

[1] Acts ix. 2. [2] Acts xxii. 16. [3] Acts xi. 20.

[4] Barnabas is represented in the Acts as the Bucer of the eldest church. He acts as intermediary between Paul and Peter, Acts ix. 27; between Antioch and Jerusalem, xi. 22; between Paul and the people of Antioch, xi. 25; between the rich of Antioch and poor of Jerusalem, xi. 30, xii. 25; between the synagogues which do and do not believe in Christ, xiii. 3, seq.; between Jews and Gentile Christians, xv. 2, &c. The statements in Gal. ii. would not oppose this view of Barnabas, but stereotyped traits are generally a literary peculiarity of this book.

[5] Bell. iii. 2, 4.

contributed its share. If the laurel-grove of Daphne recalled the legends of the Greek gods,[1] the holy hill of Casius went back to the primitive cults of Syria. The suburbs of this immense place were inhabited by native-born Syrians; but the city itself had been designed for a Greek city by Seleucus Nicator, whose idea was that it should gain Syria the same renown for culture as has been won for Egypt by Alexandria, the residence of the Ptolemies. That fanatical imitator of Greek culture and Roman politics, Antiochus Epiphanes, afterwards filled his capital, rich as it was already in architectural beauties, with every building luxury could suggest—temples, aqueducts, baths, basilicas and colonnades—so that it wore a more modern and Greek aspect than any other Syrian town. At this time it was the seat of the proconsul, and a strong Roman garrison held down the turbulent people.[2]

Now it is a matter of experience that a mixture of nationalities such as existed here leads easily to the deterioration of both; and the fact remains that in morals Antioch ranked as even more corrupt than Rome.[3] But the future belonged to this city. For the next thousand years it was to be the most important city of Asia, so greatly was it favoured by its situation and noble surroundings. Placed between the stately Orontes and the cliffs of Mount Silpius, it united the strength of a fortress with all the advantages of a commercial city and all the beauties of a well-watered mountain country.

The Jews ranked among the oldest inhabitants of this city, which was to have so great an influence on the future. They had settled there under the Seleucids, and had been granted equal rights with the Greek and Macedonian inhabitants. Thus they administered their own affairs and enjoyed self-government under an ethnarch, here called "Archon."[4] In wealth and influence the Jews of Antioch fell little short of their Alexandrian brethren. In the time of Herod, the Jew Saramalla of

[1] Philostr. Apoll. 1, 16.
[2] Bell. vii. 3, 3.
[3] Juvenal, 3, 62.
[4] Ant. xii. 3, 1; Bell. vii. 3, 2—4, loc. class.

Antioch was reputed the richest man in the whole province.[1] After the temple of Jerusalem, the synagogue of Antioch was one of the most venerable sites of Judaism, for it boasted of owning and using in its services the sacred vessels which Antiochus Epiphanes had carried off from the temple of Zerubbabel. Now here at the meeting-point of Gentile religions, where Greek wantonness touched Syrian lasciviousness, the synagogue met with many successes. "Because a multitude of Greeks," says Josephus, "went over to the Jewish worship, this Hellenic city also entered the sphere of Judaism."[2] Here, then, was a specially large number of proselytes, to whose religious sensibility the Messianic preaching was primarily directed.

It could not be long before preachers of the Messiah's appearance came to this place. Immediately after the first persecution in the year 36, there arrive those disciples from Jerusalem, Cyprus and Cyrene, who brought the good news to the synagogue of Antioch. We are not told that a struggle followed. A community of such a size and so strongly Hellenized, a Jewish colony long accustomed, like that of Alexandria, to every form of dissent, could not be flung into any further ferment by such tidings. So the followers of the Galilean Christ were left alone; at least, there is no trace of any opposition.

Some of these first comers were held in high honour by the church of Syria. At all events, they were known by name in the following century. Thus among the founders of the Syrian church was Menahem, foster-brother and playfellow of the tetrarch Antipas—a Galilean, therefore, who from his age must be counted among the "elder disciples." One Lucius[3] is named amongst the Cyrenians notorious for their zeal in propagandism.[4] As Menahem represents the connection with the preaching beside the lake, Simon of Cyrene, surnamed Niger, represents the memory of Golgotha. At least, it is exceedingly probable that Simon Niger and the Simon who bore the cross are one and

[1] Bell. i. 13, 5; Ant. xx. 2, 2.
[2] Bell. vii. 3, 3, ii. 18, 2.
[3] Not the one mentioned in Rom. xvi. 21.
[4] Ant. xvi. 7, 2.

the same, as the two sons of the latter, Alexander and Rufus, were, according to Mark xv. 21, well known in the church. Further, we learn from the Acts that both the Cyrenians, Simon and Lucius, were prophets; that is to say, the spirit had opened their mouths to testify in the synagogues of Antioch that Jesus is the Christ. JOSES, too, surnamed BARNABAS, belonged at first to the church of Jerusalem. Moreover, active intercourse with Jerusalem is indicated by the occasional appearance of the wandering prophet AGABUS[1] and various other natives of Jerusalem, who, visiting their new friends, were seized by the spirit, and preached, prophesied, and spoke in tongues, thus bringing the fuel of the early Christian inspiration into the young congregation.[2]

Here, however, connections were formed with many other points besides Jerusalem. The preponderant Hellenistic element and superior number of God-fearing Gentiles who joined the church gave it a less Jewish aspect. At all events, when Peter visited Antioch in 53, it was the custom there to live "after the manner of the Gentiles." The uncircumcised shared in the love-feasts; the Jewish laws concerning meats were neglected.[3] Moreover, it is the view of the Acts that the name *Christiani* was first generally applied to believers in Antioch. This would imply that neither the synagogue nor the Roman officials of the proconsul Vitellius regarded this church as anything more than a Jewish sect, so that the new name separated them as a *genus tertium* from Jews and Gentiles.

On the other hand, it has been reasonably objected that a *Latin* name would hardly have been given to a church of their own city by the Jews, Greeks and Syrians of Antioch,[4] but that it probably originated before in Rome. Nor has it yet been explained why, if this name arose in the year 39, it does not

1 Acts xi. 22 and xxi. 10. 2 Acts xi. 27. 3 Gal. ii. 12.

4 Baur, Paulus, i. 103 (90). Also the express testimony of Tac. Ann. xv. 44: quos vulgus (urbis) Christianos appellabat. The use in 1 Peter iv. 16 and James ii. 7, simply denotes the later date of these writings.

occur before historians of the time of Trajan, and that, too, in Roman writers like Pliny, Tacitus and Suetonius.[1] Now the Christian church at Antioch was not large enough to attract the notice of the great city for any length of time. They still assembled in private houses, and even in 53 general love-feasts of all the brethren were possible,[2] so that there could have been no great number of them.

But this makes no difference in the significance of the congregation itself for the future of the church. The important thing is, that here there was a brotherhood consisting essentially of proselytes, for now they were soon joined by such Gentiles as would never have passed through the forecourts of the synagogues. However, this close intercourse of the Syrian Jewish Christians with the uncircumcised in common *agapes* and common prayer-meetings slowly raised a barrier, never again to be overthrown, between orthodox Jews and their Christian offshoot. When indeed, some fifteen years later, a final breach with the synagogue appeared to be the inevitable consequence, a strong reaction set in, extending even to the original founders of the situation; but it was too late, and even James, Peter and Barnabas, were unable to set back the development which had taken place.[3] Nevertheless, the other school remained well represented here; numerous literary productions of Jewish Christianity originated in the Syrian capital; and in particular the larger half of the writings which make up the New Testament must be divided between Antioch and Rome, just as Jerusalem and Babylon share the chief group of those which make the Old Testament.

At EPHESUS, the second place of the Mediterranean, the religious process ran its course less quickly than at Antioch. Obscure as the relation of the Ephesian Jews to the Messianic tidings remains, it is at least certain that the news of John's preaching had made an impression, and the Baptist movement

[1] Cf. Lipsius, Ueber den Ursprung u. ältest. Gebr. d. Christennam. 1873.
[2] Gal. ii. 12.
[3] Gal. ii. 12, seq.

had found a response among the Jews here. The great movement of the year 34 had reached the community of Ephesus, thanks to the active intercourse between Judæa and Asia Proconsularis. The Acts know of "about twelve men" in Ephesus who had received the baptism of John in the Jordan,[1] thus taking on themselves the duty of helping on the approaching day of the Messiah by fasting, repentance and prayer. These were elements that soon joined Christianity.

However, the rigid Pharisaism which provided the most vehement opponents of Jesus' Messiahship, was also strongly represented. It is clear from the Apocalypse, which was composed in Ephesus, that the appearance of the Messiah was known here before Paul's first visit in 55, for it regards Paul as an interloper—a view, moreover, presupposed by the Epistle to the Corinthians and by the Acts.

Pre-eminent among the Ephesian Christians was the Alexandrian APOLLOS, who had received his first impulse from John's Baptist movement, and throughout his subsequent Christian activity maintained unbroken membership of the Baptist community.[2] The Acts, however willing to ascribe the foundation of the Ephesian Church to Paul, describes Apollos' Christianity characteristically: "This man was instructed in the way of the Lord, and being fervent in the Spirit, he spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord, knowing only the baptism of John."

The course of development here seems, then, to have been that John's preaching and Baptist movement were brought from Palestine to the Ghetto of Ephesus; that at the tidings of the day of judgment and the Messiah's coming there gathered together a small church of penitents reckoned by the Acts as twelve in number, until a Christian husband and wife, Aquila and Priscilla, who came from Pontus and had worked before in Rome and Corinth, took Apollos to them, "and expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly."[3]

As to ROME, the news of the Messiah's coming reached the

[1] Acts xix. 1–4. [2] 1 Cor. i. 14. [3] Acts xviii. 26.

city exactly as it had reached Ephesus, and provoked no less excitement than in the excitable port of Ionia. Indeed, it must be recorded with shame that the message of peace led to such disorderly rioting, affrays and uproar, among the hot-blooded, noisy population of the Jewish quarter, that the Roman police had to resort to expulsions *en masse*.[1] Thus we learn further from the Acts that Paul met at Corinth Aquila, who had just arrived from Italy, because Claudius had ordered all Jews to quit Rome.[2] Considering, too, Paul's exhortations in the Epistle to the Romans for Roman Christians to give due obedience to every authority, and Suetonius' statement that Chrestus was the source of the Jewish disorders, it must be inferred that there were violent and lasting disturbances, provoked by the tidings of Christ's coming, and justifying such sweeping measures as the expulsion of from 20,000 to 30,000 Jews.

Dio Cassius, indeed, knows nothing of this banishment. On the contrary, he says: "At that time the Jews had grown so numerous that they could not perhaps have been expelled from the city without causing great disturbances. For this reason Claudius did not banish them in so many words, but forbade them to hold the assemblies commanded by their laws."[3]

Still banishments took place and in large numbers. That energetic missionary Aquila must have been expelled from Rome, with his wife Priscilla, simply as being the leader of the Christians. But Dio Cassius may well be right in saying *universal* expulsion of the Jews would have been impossible without exciting the most far-reaching disturbances. It is also contradicted by the simple fact that five years later Paul assumes the existence both of a Jewish and of a Christian church in Rome. Moreover, as the edict, according to the chronology of Paul's life, must have been issued in the last year of Claudius, its imperfect execution is easily accounted for.

Under these circumstances the followers of Jesus also re-assembled quickly. Their church was avowedly chief among the

[1] Suet. Claud. 25; Acts xviii. 1. [2] Acts xviii. 1. [3] Dio, 60, 6.

Italian churches and possessed influence over them, or Paul would hardly have been at the pains of writing the Epistle to the Romans. But it follows from this particular document that the Roman church clung to the law in spite of their disagreements with the synagogue, and, further, that they shared their country's political disaffection all the more because the power of resistance in the state, corrupt as it was, might easily be underrated amid the disorders of the capital. Moreover, disaffection of this sort only grows up in a body whose numbers command respect. Apart from this, the church in Rome might be considered of some size from the reference in the Epistle to the Romans, which says that the faith of the Romans is famed over the whole world.[1] Besides, a *small* congregation would have passed almost unnoticed amid the noise and movement of the great city. But the persecution of the Christians in 64 shows that the Christians were *universally* known in Rome, for the emperor could not shift the guilt of his incendiarism upon unknown persons. Perhaps the Christians under Nero were in part paying for the noisy scenes under Claudius, which had made them known to the court and to the Roman populace.

From Rome, then, the new school had spread over Italy. At all events, we hear in 61 of brethren in the beautiful city of Naples, a city blessed with Jews. They doubtless originally belonged to the synagogue;[2] and as we hear of Christians in Cumæ proportionately earlier,[3] we may perhaps assume the existence of similar communities hard by in Naples and in a number of other Italian towns.

Thus the followers of the Gospel had already secured a footing in all the leading cities of the Mediterranean. The particulars of their progress will be more clearly indicated by the life of

1 Rom. i. 8.

2 Acts xxviii. 13; the Jews, Jos. Vita. 3; the city, Strabo 5, 4, 6; Seneca, Ep. 27.

3 Hermas, Past. Vis. 1, 1; so Ed. Dressel, p. 409. The meaning of κῶμαι is certainly a matter of dispute.

Paul. It must have been the synagogue which offered the first centre of an opposition which sprang up everywhere—the synagogue which gave the first check to a community that banished their patriarchs and their prophets, their promises and dreams of the future, inviting the nations of the east and the west to the table of the Messiah, where sat Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and whence they themselves would be cast forth into outer darkness.[1]

---

3. Internal Life of the Churches.

After an existence of ten years or more, the churches, according to Paul's express testimony, were now given a uniform organization.[2] We are therefore justified in deriving minuter details of their internal life from the Pauline Epistles, although these, it need hardly be said, had primarily none but Greek churches in view.

The congregations assembled in private houses—a hired place is only once spoken of[3]—and indeed the spacious upper chamber was a very suitable place to receive congregations of forty persons or even more. Both the daily occupation of the members, who belonged to the working classes, and the climate of Syria and Asia Minor, made it necessary to hold the meetings in the evening, when, if nothing else, the brightly-lighted rooms, with their devotees, must have made a startling impression. The common love-feast often preceded edification; the cup of remembrance and the holy bread were passed round. Not till this was over did exhortation, singing and prophecy, obtain their due.[4]

We possess a very remarkable description of such an evening assemblage in Acts xx. 7, where a participator says: "Upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow,

[1] Matt. viii. 11, 12.
[2] 1 Cor. xi. 16, xiv. 36.
[3] Acts xix. 9.
[4] So Acts xx. 7, and 1 Cor. xi. 20, seq.

and continued his speech until midnight. [And there were many lights in the upper chamber where we were gathered together]. And there sat in a window a certain young man named Eutychus; and as Paul was long preaching, he sank down with sleep."[1] We learn in more detail from 1 Cor. xiv. how these rooms were fitted with benches for men and women against the hour of prayer.[2] The latter sat apart, deeply veiled, according to the custom of Greece and Asia. Admittance was also given to such as were inwardly inclined but not yet converted; but these did not sit with the rest. They had special benches placed for them "in the room of the unlearned," where perhaps there might also be found an unbeliever brought there by curiosity.[3]

The rooms were sometimes filled to overflowing, so that the poorer members were forced to sit on the floor or footstool, as the Epistle of James, a generation later of course, complains: "If there come into your assembly a man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel, and there come in also a poor man in vile raiment, and ye have respect to him that weareth the gay clothing, and say unto him, Sit thou here in a good place; and say to the poor, Stand thou there, or sit here under my footstool."[4] The chief of the congregation regularly opened their devotions, and the reading of the Scriptures was certainly, as in the synagogue, an essential part of edification. To "hear the law" and then act upon it, is a constant exhortation of the apostles.[5] "For," says the Epistle of James, "if any be a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass; for he beholdeth himself and goeth his way, and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was." This "*word*," however, does not refer exclusively to the Greek Bible of the Old Testament; there was early in existence an account of the "glad tidings," which essentially contained the

[1] Acts xx. 7, seq. For the bracketed words, see Vol. iii. p. 423, 1st ed.
[2] 1 Cor xiv. 30, xi. 6. [3] 1 Cor. xiv. 16, 24. [4] James ii. 2, seq.
[5] Gal. iv. 10; Rom. ii. 13; James i. 22, seq.

historical matter of our Gospels: for thus only could the author of the oldest Gospel come to make Jesus say of the woman of Bethany who anointed his head: "Verily I say unto you, wheresoever this gospel shall be preached throughout the whole world, this also that she hath done shall be spoken of for a memorial of her."[1]

The churches of Palestine maintained the Jewish custom of laying the *tallith* on the head during the reading of the law, just as most Orientals, Jews, Arabs and Syrians, used to pray with their heads covered, while the Greek entered his temple uncovered.[2] Paul was the first to get rid of this custom in his churches, by suggesting that it involved a striking symbolism; for as Moses put a veil over his face, so to that day a veil remained over their hearts in the reading of the Old Testament, wherefore it was not revealed to them that the old covenant was done away with in Christ.[3]

Now just as in the synagogue the Midrash was attached to the reading of the Scriptures, and then this edifying application of the text provided the basis of a sermon by the learned in the law, so here, when one prophet had done speaking, another rose to utter "any word of exhortation that might be in him."[4] Observing due succession, "in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving, they let their requests be known unto God."[5] In part also it was a preparation for worship to spend the day in reflecting upon "whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue and if there be any praise."

Further, to judge from passages like Rev. x. 4, seq., the antiphonies of the synogogue seem also to have been early imitated in the Christian congregation.

[1] Mark xiv. 9; Matt. xxvi. 13.
[2] 1 Cor. xi. 2, 4; 2 Cor. iii. 18.
[3] 2 Cor. iii. 12, seq.
[4] Acts xiii. 15; 1 Cor. xiv. 29.
[5] Phil. iv. 6.

Though this form of worship contained much that was similar to the synagogue, great freedom prevailed. They insisted upon letting all gifts have their full development, and debarring none from the joy of personal co-operation.[1] Every one was to participate; every one had the fullest right to contribute whatever he was able. Thus each of these simple men felt his vocation to be the founder of a church, an apostle, a prophet, a teacher, a worker of miracles and exorcist, to speak with tongues or interpret them, according to the gift entrusted to them by the Spirit.[2]

But it must not be supposed that everything was left to the inspiration of the moment. Extemporary speaking was only one form of discourse, which, owing to want of practice in public speaking, often passed into stammering, sobbing and weeping; that is, into the outbursts of feeling known as speaking with tongues. As a rule, everything was prepared. The psalm which one intended to sing, the doctrinal discourse which another had at heart, the interpretation of a prophetic passage revealed to him in silence, were all ready, as the apostle says, when the congregation met.[3] Even the speaker in tongues had already come to an understanding with the man who was to interpret for him, in case speech should fail him.[4] For however firm the conviction that fiery prophecy and lucid teaching and wild ecstasy of speech belonged to that same spirit of God and Jesus which had once spoken through the prophets, there was perfect sincerity about them, perfect freedom from self-deception. It was acknowledged that all gifts of grace were freely given, and peculiar to the subject himself. One "*has* a tongue;" one *has* this sighing, and shouting, and sobbing; another has it not. So far, then, Paul can say: "When ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifi-

[1] 1 Cor. xiv. 29.
[2] 1 Cor. xii. 29.
[3] 1 Cor. xiv. 26. Even γλῶσσαν ἔχει.
[4] 1 Cor. xiv. 26—28.

cation."[1] Thus what we are generally inclined to regard as a perfectly involuntary outburst of inspiration was yet not wholly unprepared, and Paul, for example, is well aware that the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets.[2]

But, as a rule, the proceedings were far from consisting of mere outbursts of feeling. If a member did not give an address, he still had the right of expressing his opinion upon what the prophets had said. Paul repeatedly maintains the right to this criticism as the gift of discriminating and judging minds, so as to prevent enthusiasm from degenerating into sentimentality.[3] Even the "unlearned" and the Gentile were not condemned to complete silence; they might from their places join in the Amen, retained by the Christians from the usage of the synagogue, to enforce the words of the speaker when he said something that met with their approval.[4] Who can doubt what the apostle says, that the sight of so devout a congregation was calculated to carry away even cold natures, to startle and overcome them? He had often seen an unbeliever struck by the homely words of these men, feeling himself convicted and seen through, thinking each word directed against himself, till he saw every secret sign and inclination and design of his heart disclosed, and fell down upon his face in contrition, crying, "God is in you of a truth."[5]

Dealing essentially as they did with the approaching end of the world, the discourses did not fail to maintain the deep impression made by these hours of nightly edification. At the same time a rapid development took place in song, i.e. the distinction between psalms, hymns and spiritual odes, which was made in the following century.[6] Thus the "Song of the Lamb," mentioned in the Apocalypse, was possibly one of the usual hymns on Christ. The surviving fragments, indeed, date from a later period, and are only an echo of Old Testament

[1] 1 Cor. xiv. 26. [2] 1 Cor. xiv. 32. [3] 1 Cor. xii. 10, xiv. 29.
[4] 1 Cor. xiv. 16. [5] 1 Cor. xiv. 24—26. [6] Col. iii. 16.

poetry. In art, perhaps, the head was not more successful than the hand, which in a very great majority of cases has left but mediocre testimony to its power upon the tombs of the following century. But in the sphere of poetry there were the treasures of the Old Testament. The psalms of the Hebrews, Suetonius tells us, made a profound impression when heard by Cæsar's funeral pyre; they could have made no less when after nightfall the stillness of the deserted streets was broken by their monotonous strains.

Here, as in every religion, singing was the best missionary agent. The Gentiles in the "seat of the unlearned" were carried away by the thunders of Isaiah or the passionate complaint of the Psalmist, infinitely different from the frigid and hackneyed songs to "Phœbus' golden lyre" or "divine Cytheræa of the broidered throne, weaver of wiles," long the object of the Sophists' contempt. The ecstatic speaking, too, produced an effect. Just as Swabians and Franks were carried away by the Romance preaching of Bernard of Clairvaux, and, without understanding a syllable of the alien tongue, wept and groaned and offered up their possessions, such here may have been the influence exerted by the unintelligible speech of ecstasy. The quivering of the whole person, the gleam of the eye, the passion of the gestures—in short, the contagious power of all true inspiration—had their full effect. The upper chambers filled while the temple and the synagogue grew emptier.

Naturally, opposition sprang up. It is abundantly clear, from the persecutions such as Paul endured in Galatia,[1] from his savage ill-treatment at Philippi,[2] from the showers of stones that rained upon Jason's sheltering house at Thessalonica,[3] from the vigorous attack upon the church at Corinth,[4] and the violent scenes between believers and unbelievers in Rome,[5] that all did not quit the congregation with the same impressions; Paul,

[1] Gal. vi. 17, iii. 4; Acts xiv. 19.
[2] 1 Thess. ii. 2.
[3] Acts xvii. 5; 1 Thess. ii. 14.
[4] Acts xviii. 12.
[5] Sueton. Claud. 25.

indeed, says of his churches that they only endured the same sufferings as their brethren in Judæa.[1]

Perhaps, too, actual worship was not the special scene of conversion, nor the power that exercised the strongest attraction. The best work was done by the inner world of the Christian household, the wealth of inward life. The new faith found its best support in opposition to the narrowing of Roman life to mere legal formulæ, in the resistance of the infinite human spirit to the annihilation of the individual by the absolutism of the Roman empire. It gave the spirit unity in its conception of the universe, while aiding the heart to righteousness. This little community gained not the least of its glories from the fact that amid universal scepticism it contained men who found the meaning of life clear, and knew that the secret of life was enclosed in a single word, because for them Christ had become the divine power and divine wisdom. For them, the universe, upon the origin of which the philosophical temper of the time brooded darkly, was a trusted home, with laws which they could point out. Every event had in their eyes a reference to the coming of their Lord. Their whole life was one long expectation of Jesus. In the cradle, the cry of love was uttered over the infant Christian: "Suffer little children to come unto me." As they advanced in years, youth and maiden grew up envisaging the advent of the Captain and Bridegroom of their Christianity. Those that died had overcome, had fought the good fight, and attained the crown of life. They had gone, not to the dim unknown, but to a world where they beheld the temple of God. "They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more; neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat. For the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters; and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes."[2]

The church's whole conception of life is based upon the following formula, which clearly has made its way into the

[1] 1 Thess. ii. 14. [2] Rev. vii. 16.

second Epistle of Timothy as a faithful saying from an older prayer in general use: "If we be dead with him, we shall also live with him; if we suffer, we shall also reign with him; if we deny him, he also will deny us; if we believe not, yet he abideth faithful; he cannot deny himself."[1] It was this inner life which had a magnetic attraction for all who wrestled with themselves for inward unity. So many men of this time felt the need of giving new substance to their religious consciousness, left void and empty by the departure of the old gods. Justin and Pseudo-Clement depict their former life in paganism as a state of dissatisfied unrest. To a restless and troubled spirit like this, the sight of a true Christian, upon whom the peace of Jesus had really descended, gave much food for thought. "They see," says Justin in his Apology, "men formerly tyrannical, converted; or they notice how their neighbour endures everything cheerfully, or how a cheated fellow-traveller takes injustice meekly."[2] "It surprises them," says Tertullian in the Apologeticus, "that we love one another, for they hate one another; that we are ready to die one for another, for they would rather take their own lives; that we regard each other as brothers, for amongst them the love of real brothers is but feigned."[3]

All Christian apologists are full of such statements, how the sobriety of the Christian matron, the fidelity of the slave, the honesty of the boy which would put another to the blush, were a silent mission in themselves; the saying was fulfilled in them, that the meek should inherit the earth. The secret of their success was the impression made by the inward reconciliation of the Christian. It was their quiet and reserved religious temper, their self-denying poverty amid a pleasure-seeking world, their firm restraint in a time of general laxity, their conscience full of trust in the promises of the gospel, and their expectation of a vast catastrophe, shared by a paganism that despaired of itself—all this it was that caused Christianity to exercise upon men's minds an influence that grew with every decade.

[1] 2 Tim. ii. 11. [2] Apol. i. 12, seq. [3] Tertull. Apologet. ch. xxxix.

Furthermore, a growing disgust at the profligacy of public life spread in the cities themselves. Theatre, circus and stage, had long ceased to serve art; public life no longer served liberty or the welfare of the empire. This was bitterly felt by all the better sort; but while this better sort continued along the road they condemned, these little congregations endeavoured to build up a new world, a world that transferred the centre of life from the forum to the inner sanctuary of the home. The "kingdom" was first to take shape in the Christian *family;* the world for which Christ is responsible consists in a series of such families, called Ecclesia or Church. Outside it are the impure, subject to the law of sin and destruction. This position of things further explains the composition of the churches as it meets us in the apostolic Epistles and the Acts. Women predominate, and among the men are a surprising number of slaves.

The subtle instinct of woman had been quick to discover that the new religion offered the means of regeneration and renewal for her sex, degraded as it had been by a corrupt period and harsh laws. The facility of divorce and purely legal view of the *connubium* had lowered woman and desolated the family. Here at once was a deep and effective contrast with the deplorable state of the marriage-tie in Roman society. Marriage was conceived of as the mystical relation of Christ to his Church, which therefore must be holy, pure and indissoluble.[1] Women may well have felt that their honour and peace were not secured by liberty of divorce, but by this conception of marriage after a heavenly pattern. Even the Essene over-praise of celibacy, which everywhere found entry into Christian churches, must have been welcome to them; it was at least the opposite of that common and degrading view which holds that a woman's life in general has but *one* object, or perhaps none.

Similar reasons actuate the Church in its exceptional attitude towards slaves. The question of slavery, like the question of

[1] Eph. v. 21, seq.

marriage, had become a calamity at which every government laboured to no effect. No new regulations, no kindness, no severity, were of more avail to heal this moral sore. As long as domestic life was healthy, slavery was possible. But with universal demoralization and the constant increase of the multitude of slaves, slavery had grown to a social danger of the first magnitude, a perennial source of moral corruption. Freemen and slaves laboured to excel one another in mutual demoralization. The old slave corrupts his young master; the youthful freeman degrades the unresisting servant. Even the moral philosopher Seneca upholds aphorisms such as, "Against slaves all is permitted," although strongly condemning a man who converts his slaves into food for carp.[1] The law treats them as objects devoid of will. Contracts with them are not binding; female slaves can be given over to dishonour even against their will; their marriage is a fiction, and adultery cannot be committed with a slave.[2] However, to prevent all difficulties, Cato the censor simply forbade marriage among his slaves and encouraged promiscuity.[3]

The belief that all men are sons of God and slavery an injustice, now appears in the world for the first time. A Christian prophet looks sadly upon the bustling market of Ephesus and recounts what is for sale there: "Beasts and sheep and horses and chariots and slaves and souls of men."[4] Jesus' words, "But ye are all brothers," began to become a principle of social reform. The Church began to judge the world also. Relations to others were not in her power, and indeed she uttered warnings against unlawful enfranchisement.[5] But within her own bosom she could and did atone for injustice. That was the only place, the Utopia, where master and servant were equal. What was known as a masquerade in the Saturnalia was here realized. A slave might

[1] De Clem. i. 18.

[2] 1 Seneca, Controv. 5, 33. Plautus, Pseudol. i. 2; Digest. 38 t. 10.

[3] Plut. Cato Maj. 21; cf. Tertull. Ad Uxor. 2, 8.

[4] Rev. xviii. 13.

[5] 1 Cor. vii. 21.

be elder, presbyter or bishop, while his master was catechumen. "I beseech you," writes Paul to the Corinthians, "ye know the house of Stephanas, that it is the first-fruits of Achaia, and that they have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints, that ye submit yourselves unto such."[1] The family for which the apostle claims such authority is a family of slaves;[2] those on whom he enjoins this obedience are citizens, householders and magistrates.[3] No wonder that the tidings of the gospel spread from one slave-room to another, and that the whole class was soon reckoned among the silent associates of the new faith; for we can see how closely their interests are touched by the first Epistle to the Corinthians, and the Epistles to Philemon and to the Ephesians in particular.

Here, then, is the completion of a new institution, almost as radically opposed to the things of this world as the attempt in Jerusalem to do away with property and separate family life. War was declared against the harsh rule of a purely formal growth of law; human religious feeling essayed to shape the world itself, now that the world of political wisdom threatened to leave its old grooves.

---

4. Conceptions of Jewish Christianity.

The spread of Christianity through the Dispersion was followed by the growth of the churches above mentioned. These were called in common parlance Judæo-Christian, although generally including a number of Gentiles by birth. The law was rigidly observed, the more so as time went on; but the law had not forbidden the conversion of Gentiles to the covenant of Israel. In this respect, the Judæo-Christian propaganda did but follow the practice of the Pharisees. Hence rigidly Jewish-Christian churches, like that of Rome, still owned their Gentile

[1] 1 Cor. xvi. 16. [2] Cf. xvi. 17 with i. 11. [3] Rom. xvi. 23.

proselytes.[1] Even Paul's bitter enemies would not reject, but Judaize, the Gentile brethren. A book so decidedly Jewish as the Apocalypse assumes that the blood of Christ has redeemed a nation "out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation, and hath made them unto God kings and priests."[2] Dependence upon the Jewish law is therefore more typical of a Judæo-Christian church than a community of unmixed Jews. The demands made upon these proselytes were already settled by the usage of the synagogue, and did not require to be fixed *ab initio* by the Christians.[3] In the opinion of the Acts, the regulations for proselytes it is acquainted with, bidding them abstain from meats sacrificed to idols, from blood, from things strangled and from unchastity, were introduced by a special compact of Jewish and Gentile Christians in a synod at Jerusalem. Paul knows nothing of this;[4] and probably the actual course of events was simply that the proselytes, in their intercourse with Jewish brethren, could not but refrain from what was "abomination" to Jews. At all events, observance of these rules was the least which a Judæo-Christian who observed the law could demand of the Gentile brother, while the zealot was for enforcing the law in its *entirety*. In their view, the Christian proselytes of the gate should become proselytes of righteousness by circumcision, and so be actually incorporated in the people of the covenant. Some influential Judæo-Christians were unwilling to go so far, and permitted conversion on condition of abstention from meats sacrificed to idols and personal purity from the sexual indulgence which other Greeks permitted themselves.[5] However, the contributions for Jerusalem imposed upon the Gentiles follow the analogy of the temple-tax paid by the Dispersion, rather than the legislation for proselytes.

It follows that both Jewish communities, the orthodox and the schismatic or Christian, adopted the same attitude towards

1 Rom. xi. 13, seq.
2 Rev. v. 9, seq.
3 Cf. above, Vol. iii. p. 131 (Eng. trans.).
4 Cf. Acts xv. with Gal. ii.
5 Rev. ii. 24, i. 14.

the law. The Jew-born was bound unconditionally by the law; the Jews' friend or Gentile proselyte, by the supplementary ordinances. So, too, when some in the new schismatic church began to make efforts after a wider freedom, and when it began to dawn upon Paul that the law had ceased to be necessary to salvation in the kingdom as conceived of by Jesus, where all depended on the disposition, the great majority even then refused to change their traditional customs. They preferred to alter the gospel, proposing to attribute words to Jesus which in part are inconsistent with the preaching of the kingdom, and in part, at least, make a false generalization from passing words. It is not difficult to see that these originate in the opposition to an advanced development.

Thus an uncompromising party arrived at a Christ whom they represented as saying: "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled;"[1] a Christ to whom the minutest ordinances were important, saying: "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."[2] This Christ of theirs did not send forth his disciples to teach all nations, but warned them above all not to cast pearls before swine, nor give the children's bread to the dogs; and just as he himself had only come to the lost sheep of Israel, so he forbade the disciples to go into the way of the Gentiles and the cities of the Samaritans, for they would not have gone over the cities of Israel till the Son of Man be come.[3]

The entire renunciation of missions to the Gentiles would necessarily follow from this, as indeed we find actually maintained at Jerusalem.[4] But this certainly was not the average view of the Judæo-Christians. They objected, not so much to the addition of Gentile brethren, as to a fundamental transference of the

[1] Matt. v. 18. [2] Matt. v. 19.
[3] Matt. x. 23. [4] Cf. Gal. ii. 2; Rom. x. and xi.

promise to the Gentile world, such as was preached by Paul as the outcome of his life. They looked instead for the Messianic salvation of Israel, the people of the covenant, according to the promises of the prophets, believing that the conversion of the Gentile world would follow upon the advent of the Messiah and the revealing of his glory.[1]

Thus the Judæo-Christians were far from making missionary work the special task of the churches, as Paul did; yet they were not disinclined to admit Gentiles on condition of pledging themselves to maintain the ordinances for proselytes, upon which the Apocalypse in particular insists vehemently.[2] Withal, a preference was always reserved for the people of Israel, which had received the pledge of God's covenants and promises, and should fall neither in this nor any other age. Adopting this position, they could confidently assert that they were the true Israel. The writer of the Apocalypse could insist, alike to Christians who withdrew from the demands of the law and to Jews who rejected belief in the Messiah, that he alone could be called a Jew who holds both the law and the Messiah; others may call themselves Jews, but in reality are not.[3]

There certainly was a contradiction in making belief in Jesus, on the one hand, an indispensable condition of salvation, and, on the other, still maintaining dependence on Israel and fulfilment of the law to be equally necessary. One point in particular was obscure; how far the death of Jesus could have been vicarious suffering and a *propitiatory sacrifice* for sin, did it not lessen the necessity for each individual to work out his salvation by fulfilling the law.[4] For the conception of the sacrificial death of the Messiah is far from a merely Pauline doctrine. Paul received it as a tradition from his predecessors, according to his own testimony.[5] It is exactly in his sense that the Apocalypse

[1] Matt. x. 5.

[2] Cf. Lipsius in Schenkel's Bib.-Lexicon, i. 200, seq.; and Die Grundanschauung d. Urgem., Jahrb. d. d. Prot.-V., 1871, p. 65, seq.

[3] Rev. ii. 9. [4] Holsten, Ev. d. Paulus u. Petrus, 142. [5] 1 Cor. xv. 3.

calls Jesus the Lamb that was slaughtered, by whose blood God redeemed the world, and with it washed us free from our sins.[1] Here, too, the righteous are not those who have kept the law, but those "who have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb."[2]

But while in these passages the Apocalypse makes everything depend on belief in Jesus and the sacrifice of his blood which purifies us from all sin, there are other passages in which 144,000 who are sealed with the name of the Lamb and the Father appear on the hill of Zion, where the Lamb sits in judgment on the last day. They, too, are redeemed from earth, but the reason of their preference over all the other blessed lies in their works after the law. "These are they which were not defiled with women; and in their mouth was found no guile, for they are without fault. They were redeemed as firstlings."[3] Only those, moreover, will be in the heavenly Jerusalem who have not dealt with defilement, and practise neither lying nor abomination.[4] But, above all, the martyrs, who uttered the word of their testimony on earth and were careless of their lives even unto death, enjoy heaven one and all; special reward awaits them.[5]

Unbelievers, on the contrary, and the unrepentant are rejected because of "the works of their hands,"[6] for the Messiah weighs their "works and labour and patience;" and he whose works are not found perfect, he who has defiled himself with idolatrous sacrifice and fornication, and does not bear the burdens he has taken upon himself, "his candlestick shall be removed out of its place."[7]

Consequently, individual redemption by *works* is placed beside external redemption by the blood of the Lamb. Faith *and* works are the watchword of the Judæo-Christians, and such

[1] Rev. v. 6, 10, i. 5.
[2] Rev. vii. 14.
[3] Rev. xiv. 3—5.
[4] Rev. xxii. 15, ii. 6, 14, 15, 20, 24.
[5] Rev. xii. 10, seq., vi. 9, 11.
[6] Rev. ix. 20.
[7] Rev. ii. 2, seq., ii. 14, 21, 23; cf. Matt. xxv. 31, seq.

precisely was the opinion of a later writer, the author of the Epistle of James, who held, in opposition to the Pauline theology, that *both* could be maintained as conditions of belonging to Christ.

Now the self-contradiction contained in this position was, however, intensified by the fact that for a Jew morality coincided with legality; and though the external demands of morality, and those which had actually taken shape in the positive law, had carried very different value to the devout conscience ever since the days of the prophets, still no clear and conscious separation had been made between them.

Thus, indeed, the question was one of a purified ideal of righteousness in Jesus' sense; but this righteousness was to remain *national and Jewish,* so that the demands of the positive law were incorporated in it.[1] Undoubtedly, this converted the absolute value ascribed by Jesus to the inner man and helpful faith, into something relative. The kingdom of heaven no longer consists in the disposition of the inner man, but in something external, to be merited by external services. But the more sharply fidelity to the law was accentuated in obedience to the tendency of the time and in opposition to Paul, the greater was the departure from Jesus' own fundamental ideas.

There was another influence which must have operated in the same direction. Judæo-Christianity had its cardinal point distinctively in the future. As its morality was still in part the law, so its dogma is eschatology. The childlike mind, humility, meekness and purity of heart, do not now make up the kingdom; they are but conditions for entrance into an external kingdom, soon to be revealed. This is most clearly represented in the Apocalypse, which holds the view that all Christian belief is summed up in revealing "what must shortly come to pass;"[2] and represents a kingdom of God, of which it can be said that "it is here and it is there."

Indeed, the religious conception of the world which we found

[1] Holsten, loc. cit. [2] Rev. i. 1.

before held by the Pharisees, is also the conviction of the early Christians in its entirety. The world goes by in two periods. One (ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος) is just coming to its close, to give place to the future world, the age of the Messiah. The existing generation is therefore the last "upon whom the ends of the world are come."[1]

But this secular revolution is by no means confined to this terrestrial world, which is but one scene of a great drama taking place in heaven above, on earth below and under the earth.[2] It is thoroughly in keeping, therefore, with the rest, that John makes the last struggle arise in heaven, where Satan and Michael begin their contest. It is not until Satan is conquered there and hurled down to earth that the great war breaks out here.[3]

In like manner, Jesus had spoken of Satan falling as lightning to the earth;[4] and the writer of the Epistle to the Ephesians knew that "we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places."[5] More definitely, earthly history presents itself in general to the devout individual as Satan's war against Christ. Satan is the lord of this age;[6] the transition from this period to the kingdom of heaven culminates in his defeat. "Now is the judgment of this world, now shall the prince of this world be cast out."[7]

But Satan resists with all the means in his power, and these are many. As the good angels and all the host of heavenly spirits serve the Messiah and aid him, so Satan for his part is surrounded by legions of evil spirits and malignant demons. Aided by these, he strives to hinder the spread of Christ's kingdom by every wile and artifice. "When any one heareth the

[1] 1 Cor. x. 11.
[2] Cf. Lipsius, Die Grundausch. d. Urgem., Jahrb. des. d. Prot.-V. p. 75.
[3] Rev. xii. 7.
[4] Luke x. 18.
[5] Eph. vi. 12.
[6] Eph. ii. 2; 2 Cor. iv. 4.
[7] John xii. 31; cf. xiv. 30, xvi. 11; Heb. ii. 14; Col. i. 13.

word of the kingdom and understandeth it not, then cometh the wicked one and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart;"[1] or if the good seed is scattered anywhere, "the enemy comes and sows tares among the wheat and goes his way."[2] He steals after the godly with secret step, or sometimes, when the heathen multitudes rage furiously, he goes about like a roaring lion.[3] Yet if resisted, he flees away speedily.[4] Moreover, he is not fastidious; if he cannot begin in great things, he will begin in little. He incites blind multitudes against the Messiah,[5] devises contrivances to ruin whole nations,[6] and sends lying prophets whom the world runs after in amazement;[7] yet is not above upsetting a journey planned by an individual Christian,[8] nor tempting the unpractised heart of the scholar by youthful pleasures.[9] This is the struggle which the Christian has to maintain as long as this age endures, and the devil and the spirits of the air have power. The Messiah had endowed his disciples with the wondrous gift of "the Spirit" in order to smite the demons. In particular, the casting out of demons apparent in the sick or speaking through their lips, is a clear proof that the Messiah supports his followers in the strife with the prince of this world.[10] Both the Scripture and the word of Jesus give assurance that the struggle against Satan shall ultimately terminate in his overthrow.

But this very overthrow of the prince of this world is indicated by struggles that shake heaven and earth; and in this respect the last days of this æon are a time of great anguish. Quite apart from the sense of approaching disaster which at that time filled the Gentile as well as the Jewish world, the Holy Scriptures expressly declared that the new world would only issue from the bosom of the old amid fearful woes and

[1] Matt. xiii. 19. [2] Matt. xiii. 25. [3] 1 Pet. v. 8.
[4] James iv. 7. [5] John xiv. 30, viii. 44; Rev. xx. 7—10.
[6] Rev. xiii. 17. [7] Rev. xiii. 7, seq.
[8] 1 Thess. ii. 18. [9] 1 Tim. iii. 7; 2 Tim. ii. 26.
[10] 2 Cor. xii. 12; 1 Cor. xii. 28.

travailing. "It shall come to pass in the last days," it might be read in Joel, "that I will show wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood and fire and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness and the moon into blood, before the great and the terrible day of the Lord come."[1] Isaiah drew a similar picture of the last times. "Behold, the day of the Lord cometh, cruel both with wrath and fierce anger, to lay the land desolate; and he shall destroy the sinners thereof out of it. For the stars of heaven and the constellations thereof shall not give their light, the sun shall be darkened in his going forth, and the moon shall not cause her light to shine."[2]

These expressions and the like depicted the approaching struggle in fantastic grandeur. The Church came more and more to live in the belief that a complete renewal of the universe was at hand, from heaven with its angels to earth and all its creatures. The most connected summary of Christian hopes, expectations and forms of tribulation, is preserved to us in the Apocalypse. The simple grandeur of the picture, the King who comes to judgment with his angels, and sets the good upon his right hand, the evil upon his left, has here grown into a drama involving heaven and earth, wherein all Old Testament types, all forms and presentments of Jesus, live and move.

But here no less it becomes manifest how the new religion is moulded, not by external conceptions, but by the inner breath of love. It does not consist in the actual set of conceptions composing the historical atmosphere in which man respires, but in the personal fervour, courage and power, with which he strives after the eternal within the conceptions of his own age. Thus the Judæo-Christian expectations for the future are, further, true belief, though belief in the form of hope, a hope rooted in firm confidence in Jesus.

Christ, "the faithful witness," the "bright morning star," the "lion of the tribe of Judah," the "root of David," the "first-begotten of the dead," the "prince of the kings of the earth," the

[1] Joel ii. 30; cf. Acts ii. 19.

[2] Isaiah xiii. 9, seq.

"Amen," the "beginning of the creation of God," has already assumed the government of the world, according to John's revelation.[1] He is sure to defend his own from "the hour of temptation which shall come upon all the world, to try them that dwell upon the earth."[2] For, according to Jesus' promises, a great "tribulation" is at hand. As to the old serpent, Satan, who ceases not, day and night, slandering the faithful in paradise, which is now removed to heaven, he shall be cast down to earth, and there will set on foot his persecution of the faithful.[3] It is a time when there is a meaning in the watchword: Hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown.[4]

But the devil rages thus furiously only because he knows how short a time he has.[5] For it will not be long before Daniel's prophecy comes to pass. A white cloud will appear in heaven; and on the cloud sits one like unto the Son of Man, having on his head a golden crown and in his hand a sickle.[6] This is the day of condemnation looked for by the despised church. "Every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him."[7] "Kings, tribunes, rulers over thousands, bond and free, shall feel his wrath." Great and decisive battles, like Megiddo, shall be fought; but the Son of Man, the Lamb, shall prevail.[8] Then heaven will open, "and behold a white horse, and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True; and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns."[9] He is followed by the armies of heaven, riding on white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and spotless.

When the Messiah has thus assumed the rule, he will call the faithful to him by the sound of a trumpet.[10] Those that fell

[1] Rev. i. 5, iii. 14, v. 5.
[2] Rev. iii. 10; Matt. xxiv. 4, seq.
[3] Rev. xii. 10, seq.
[4] Rev. iii. 11; Matt. xxiv. 10.
[5] Rev. xii. 12.
[6] Rev. xiv. 14, after Dan. vii. 13. Cf. 1 Thess. iv. 16, seq; Matt. xxiv. 30, seq.
[7] Rev. i. 7.
[8] Rev. xvi. 16.
[9] Rev. xix. 11, after Zech. vi. 1.
[10] Rev. viii. 2; Matt. xxiv. 31; 1 Thess. iv. 16.

asleep in his name, rise from the dead. Thrones are set up, and they are placed thereon to judge the Gentiles.[1] And now follows the kingdom of the Messiah, lasting a thousand years. Those who have overcome, now rule upon earth; the Messiah gives them power over the nations, to rule them with a rod of iron, and to break them to shivers as a potter's vessel, even as he himself has received power from his Father.[2] The marriage of the Lamb has come, and his wife, the Church, makes herself ready.[3] The redeemed will sit with Christ upon the throne, and sup with him. They receive harps of God, and sing the song of Moses, the servant of God, and the "song of the Lamb," such as is sung in the Church.[4] The glories of the ancient Israel, which God withdrew to heaven because of the sins of men, are once more revealed. Heaven opens, and the saved behold the tabernacle of the testimony.[5] The hidden manna that once supported the children of Israel in their wandering through the wilderness is vouchsafed to believers. They will eat, too, of the tree of life, removed to heaven with Paradise because of Adam's sin.

As here below there was a secret understanding between their heart and God, known to none but Him, God will give each a stone, on which is a new name which no man knows save he who receives it,[6] and each becomes a pillar in the new temple, inscribed with the name of God.[7]

Thus all the glories of ancient times are restored, till at length the thousand years have passed. Then Satan, with his host, nerves himself once more. He calls the heathen from the ends of the earth, Gog and Magog, of whom Ezekiel prophesied.[8] "And they go up on the breadth of the earth and compass the camp of the saints about, but fire comes down from heaven and devours them." Now at last ensues the universal resurrection and judgment. He reveals himself from whose face the earth

[1] Rev. xx. 4, viii. 2; Matt. xxv. 31; 1 Cor. vi. 2, after Dan. vii. 9, 22, 27.
[2] Rev. ii. 28.
[3] Rev. xix. 7; Matt. xxv. 1—13.
[4] Exod. xv. 1, 21, and Plin. Ep. x. 97.
[5] Rev. xv. 5.
[6] Rev. ii. 17.
[7] Rev. iii. 12.
[8] Rev. xx. 9, Ezek. xxxviii. 39.

and the heaven fled away. The sea gives up the dead which are in it. Death and hell deliver up their dead. Books are opened, as in the prophecies of Malachi and Daniel,[1] wherein the works of the wicked are written; and another book is opened, the book of life of the Lamb, in which the redeemed are entered from the foundation of the world.[2] And the dead are judged according to their works. Whosoever is not found written in the book of life is cast into the lake of fire; and after sin is thus stamped out, the Eternal casts death and hell also into the lake of fire, where they are consumed.[3] For now there is a new heaven and a new earth. The first heaven is gone, and the first earth, and there is no more sea.[4] Now arises that city, of which Isaiah said, God would lay its foundations with sapphires and carbuncles.[5] The new Jerusalem, the holy city, descends from heaven, prepared by God as a bride decked out for her husband.[6] This is the tabernacle of God among men of which Ezekiel prophesied: "He will dwell with them and they shall be his people. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away."[7] But the holy city, the city which stands upon a hill, has its foundations laid in precious stones, such as the high-priest wore, and is adorned with gates of pearl. It had no need either of sun or moon, for the glory of God sparkling like the radiance of a jewel,[8] and the brightness of the Lamb, are the great light of which Isaiah testified that the Gentile should walk therein.[9] The city will no more be shut by night, for night has passed away. The nations stream through every gate, and offer up their goodliest possessions.[10] There shall enter into it, as the prophet says,

[1] Dan. xxii. 2; Mal. iii. 16.
[2] Rev. xx. 11, seq., xiii. 8, seq.; Phil. iv. 2; Matt. xxv. 34.
[3] Rev. xx. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 26, 54.
[4] Rev. xxi. 1, seq.; Matt. xxiv. 29.
[5] Isaiah liv. 11, 12.
[6] So also Gal. iv. 24; Phil. iv. 20.
[7] Rev. xxi. 3, 4; Ezek. xxxvii. 27; Isaiah xxv. 8.
[8] Rev. iv. 8 and xxi. 23.
[9] Is. lx. 3.
[10] Is. lx. 5—7.

nothing unclean, nor any impure; for none are left now but those who were inscribed in the book of the Lamb. Again, as Ezekiel prophesied of a spring that rises in the new Jerusalem and becomes a river, on the banks of which fruit-trees grow, whose leaves fade not and whose fruit is not consumed, and the leaves have healing powers,[1] so a stream of living water, clear as crystal, will issue from the throne of God. On either bank grows the tree of life which bears fruit in every month, and its leaves serve to heal the nations.

Thus the picture of the kingdom and the eternal life is almost a mosaic of the most brilliant pictures and promises of the prophets. A hundred eager souls must have searched the Scriptures to find all the pieces out of which the writer of the Apocalypse built his marvellous city, the revealed Jerusalem, scarcely thirty years after the death of Jesus. The hope of the faithful yearned after the promised treasures prefigured by the prophets; all pined for the cool waters of life, for the sweet fruit and healing leaves of the trees of Paradise. "The Spirit and the bride say, Come; and let him that heareth say, Come." And from heaven a voice bears witness, "Surely I come quickly;" and the believers answer, "Amen. Even so, come Lord Jesus."[2]

This was a faith, a love, a hope, that belonged to the future. This faith was in reality a rock on which a church set its foundations, a rock on which every objection or doubt was dashed to spray, and from whose hard substance the mightiest blows only drew brighter showers of sparks.

Who would come forward against men of this temper, imbued with such images? The saints with their psalms beckoned to them from above; while below, the old serpent showed its teeth at them. Their ear caught the music of the harps of God, and the harmony of the songs of the blessed; they heard in every sound the footfall of their Lord; and in the hour of prayer were fanned by the cool airs of Paradise that still earthly pangs and calm the fever of strife with a message breathed from a better world.

[1] Ezek. xlvii. 1, 7, 12. [2] Rev. xxii. 17, 20.

This was a disposition from which the shafts of doubt glanced off ineffectual; and though from time to time cooler tempers observed that, spite of all promises, the world went on its accustomed way, and the Christians were a fanciful church in the midst of hungering humanity, the answer was ready; thus, too, had it been in the days of the Flood: "They were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and knew not till the flood came and took them all away; so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be."[1]

The conviction that this kingdom would come, and that, too, in the lifetime of the existing generation, remained unshaken, though one after another the eye-witnesses of Jesus' life sank into the grave. In the tribulation of the Jewish war, the saying of the Lord was still firmly maintained: "Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled;"[2] or, as Jesus is represented as saying still more definitely: "Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom."[3]

Thus time itself, which is wont to paralyze every enthusiasm, appeared insensibly to be on the side of this conviction. The fuel that fed the flame and made any cooling of ardour impossible, was the mighty successes whereby the faith received practical assurance of its truth. These successes appeared as an outward attestation from God, though in reality based upon the essential superiority which faith always has by nature over indifference.

This thrilling movement must have spread like a consuming fire through the religious drought of the world. This becomes immediately clear by comparing this energetic, hopeful temper with the weary and spent, if not absolutely pessimistic, resignation common to the spokesmen of those schools of philosophy

[1] Matt. xxiv. 38. [2] Matt. xxiv. 34.
[3] Matt. xvi. 28; Mark ix. 1; Luke ix. 27.

which still claimed to show the people "the way to a happy life." Philo declares: "No earthly thing has true being. All are airy figments without true existence, nowise differing from dreams. On every side moves the divine principle of the world (Logos), called fortune by the great majority. Passing over cities and lands and nations, it gives each his lot, one at one time, another at another."[1]

Tacitus himself speaks of the purposeless sport of human life (*ludibria rerum humanarum cunctis in negotiis*), and though sharing with Christianity the belief in an approaching catastrophe, he does but look scornfully on mankind as it hurries to an abyss; everything confirms his belief that the gods desire not our salvation, but their own vengeance.[2] The pessimism of this great intellect, the optimism of these insignificant people, at once give the reason why Christianity must conquer, for there is greater power and a wider future in one grain of faith than in a mountain of unbelief. For the same reason, again, the form in which the faith of the prophets conquered was not the deliberate monotheism of Alexandrian Judaism. The people longed to find rest for their souls, not new theories and new doubts. Christianity, therefore, with its direct intuitive religious inspiration, had power to touch the heart, while the purely national ideal of Hellenic Judaism, with its appeal to national instincts, fell to rise no more.

[1] Quod Deus sit immut. M. i. 298, seq.
[2] Hist. i. 3, iii. 72; Ann. iv. 1, iii. 18.

C. Green & Son, Printers, 178, Strand.